DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 259	IR 004 036
TITLE	Library Services Cross Borders. Minutes of the Semi-Annual Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (84th, Toronto, Canada, May 9-10, 1974).
INSTITUTION	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISSN-0044-9652
PUB DATE	May 74
NOTE	134p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; Economics; French; *Interlibrary Loans; Library Associations; *Library Expenditures; *National Libraries; Research Libraries; *University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	ARL; Association of Research Libraries; *Canada

ABSTRACT

The minutes of the May, 1974, meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) contain the texts of five presentations about Canadian research libraries. Descriptions of the National Library of Canada, the National Science Library, and Canadian University Libraries and their associations are followed by a discussion of the problems encountered in French-language university libraries in Canada and a report from the Commission on Canadian Studies, a council formed to investigate the state of teaching and research in studies relating to Canada. The minutes record the debate and vote on a fee system proposal for interlibrary loan services, and the reports of a number of ARL commissions and executives. Two presentations, one on the economics of academic libraries are included. (KB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED129259

US ISSN 0044-9652

Library Services Cross Borders

Minutes of the Eighty-Fourth Meeting

May 9-10, 1974
Toronto, Canada

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IR004036

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

CONTENTS

Page

Opening 1

CANADIAN RESEARCH LIBRARIES: RESOURCES AND SERVICES

Introduction 2

The National Library of Canada --Guy Sylvestre 3

The National Science Library and Its Program -- Jack E. Brown 14

Canadian University Libraries and Library Associations -- Dean Halliwell 20

French-language University Libraries and Their Problems -- Rosario de Varennes 26

Commission on Canadian Studies -- T.H.B. Symons 30

FINANCING INTERLIBRARY LOAN SERVICES

Introduction -- David Weber 37

Background on ARL Studies -- David Heron 39

Implications for Action -- David Weber 43

The Arguments:

Pro -- John Humphry 49
Con -- Richard Chapin 53

Proposition for Vote -- Jay Lucker 58

ECONOMICS OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Speakers:

Matityahu Marcus 59
Warren J. Haas 65

Discussion 68

BUSINESS MEETING

Membership Vote on Interlibrary Loan Fees 73
International Education Project 88
Schedule for ARL Meetings 88
White House Conference on Library and Information Services 90
Research Libraries Group Report 90
Systems and Procedures Exchange Center 92
Report of the Executive Director 94
Report of the President 96

APPENDICES

A. Research Libraries in Service to Scholarship 99
B. Center for Chinese Research Materials April, 1974 Meeting 102
C. Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project Report 1973 110
D. Report of the Committee on the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging 114
E. White House Conference Resolution 115
F. Attendance at the 84th Meeting 116
G. Commissions, Committees and Task Forces of the ARL 120
H. Membership of the ARL 125

4

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 84th Meeting

Ralph H. Hopp, presiding

The Eighty-Fourth Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was held at the Hyatt Regency Toronto Hotel in Toronto, Canada on May 9 and 10, 1974.

President Ralph H. Hopp opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing new and alternate representatives attending their first ARL meeting and guests of the Association.

Mr. Hopp preceded the formal program by asking the membership to submit to any Board member before the Business meeting the names of candidates for the position of Librarian of Congress. L. Quincy Mumford will retire December 31, 1974.

Mr. Hopp then discussed the theme of the program "Library Services Cross Borders."

CANADIAN RESEARCH LIBRARIES: RESOURCES AND SERVICES

Introduction

MR. HOPP: Our theme, "Library Services Cross Borders," has multiple meanings. The various program elements will bring these out in due course. There is nothing really new here, for ARL did cross the border and came to Canada two times before. Looking back in the history of the Association, among the very first concerns and the activities of the Association were some having to do with interlibrary loan. This morning we will have the opportunity of hearing about Canadian research libraries from several Canadian library leaders. I am most grateful indeed to Bruce Peel, Librarian of the University of Alberta in Edmonton, who with his Canadian colleagues have organized a full morning's program.

MR. PEEL: This morning our Canadian content program is intended to acquaint you with some of the achievements, some of the problems and some of the solutions which Canadian research libraries have. This afternoon, of course, you will be seeing one of our fine new library buildings, the seventh wonder of Toronto.

Our first two speakers are our two National Librarians, and I would like to tell you that Canadian librarians are delighted with the leadership which these two men have given to library service in this country in recent years. It is quite exciting, what they have been doing. Our National Library is only 22 years old. During the incumbency of the first National Librarian, he was engaged in organizing the institution and constructing the building. Now, Dr. Guy Sylvestre has been taking the National Library services to the farthest reaches of this country. Likewise, Dr. Jack Brown has vitalized or revitalized the services of the National Science Library.

Dr. Sylvestre might be introduced as an author, librarian and politician, and when I say politician, I am using that in the sense that all of us who are administrators should be politicians in trying to influence the powers that be into supporting library programs. He has been very successful indeed in persuading the government to support the programs in which he is interested. I shall now call on him to tell you about the National Library of Canada.

* * * *

THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA

Guy Sylvestre
National Librarian of Canada

I welcome this opportunity to tell you something about the National Library of Canada. As you know, my friend and colleague Jack Brown will speak to you later about the National Science Library. Both our presentations will, I hope, make clear to you how the two institutions complement one another, how they attempt to coordinate as best they can their programs and to cooperate in fields of common concern. Since I was asked to speak first, it will be my duty to comment briefly on general policies so that the respective roles of the two libraries and of some related agencies and other libraries may be seen in the more general context within which policies are developed and programs implemented.

If there are anywhere in the world countries which are easy to govern, Canada is not one of them. Our country is larger in area than the United States, yet its population is one tenth as large. It follows that the developing and operating costs of any communications system - highways, transportation, telephone, etc., including library networks - are higher per capita here than anywhere else; we have two official languages and a multicultural policy, which creates problems, of course, but also offers great opportunities; we have no federal department of education, although the federal government pays 50 percent of the postsecondary education operating costs, but ten provincial ones which have full jurisdiction over their respective educational systems at all levels. I could go on in this vein, but there is no time and I probably have said enough to indicate to you that in a country whose geography is a daily challenge, we Canadians tend to specialize in the art of making the development of national policies as complicated as possible.

Be that as it may, in the review of the scientific and technical information policy in Canada conducted four years ago by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), one could read: "Canada has a large number of libraries, information and documentation centers, data banks, etc. and can justly be proud of its achievements." Well, it is gratifying to read such remarks, although our own evaluation of our resources is not as optimistic. We have nowhere any library whose collections could be compared to those of the Library of Congress, Harvard, Yale or New York Public. The University of Toronto Library, which we will discuss and visit later to-day, is one which qualifies for a franchise in the major league, but only a handful of Canadian libraries meet the criteria for admission to ARL. The OECD report went on to say that "the new National Library Act, the cabinet decision of the 19th December 1969, and the setting up of 'Information Canada', together represent an important step forward and a turning point in the evolution of Canadian information policy." Speaking only for myself, may I say that the policies set in these two documents are general policies, that they are not explicit enough in many respects, that they should be further developed and refined in the years ahead, that the present institutional arrangements are not in my opinion as effective as they should be and that my hope is that, as a result of current studies and discussions at the highest level which I am not at liberty to discuss in public as yet, a better integrated national library structure will facilitate the planning of policies, the coordination of programs and the development of a general purpose national network. The basic problems facing Canadian libraries are the same as those which confront U.S. libraries, and we are examining here, in our own context, the problems which your National Commission on Libraries and Information Science has identified as central in its recent draft proposal.

The National Library of Canada is governed by a strong act, the kind of legislation which the U.S. Commission suggests for the Library of Congress, but the National Library obviously does not have the kind of human and financial resources available to LC, and it will never have at its disposal as massive resources for the provision of reference, lending or bibliographic services. For instance, NPAC is the kind of program which very few countries can afford, and we Canadians will continue to depend on U.S. resources for all sorts of esoteric collections and to take advantage of the liberality of our American colleagues. We should attempt however, to become as self-sufficing as a country like ours can afford, and most of our recent efforts aim at facilitating the sharing of library materials through the rationalization of research collections, the cooperative processing of library materials and the improvement of communications throughout the developing library network. More remains to be done than was accomplished, we still have a long way to go; but we are in motion. Canada still has few large libraries and the National Library of Canada is still a very young institution. Interdependence is accordingly even more crucial here than it is south of the border.

The National Library was established as recently as 1953 and, until it moved into the new National Library and Archives Building in Ottawa in 1967, it was more a bibliographic center than a true library. For some 15 years its staff concentrated its efforts on two basic functions: (1) the compilation and publication of the national bibliography, Canadiana, and (2) the building and maintenance of a national union catalog. More recently, in the sixties, it also started to publish an annual list of Canadian Theses Accepted by Canadian Universities and to reproduce Canadian theses on microfilm (we recently switched to microfiche), and it published a union list of Periodicals in the Social Sciences and Humanities, which complemented the NSL's Union List of Scientific Serials. The Library had no collection worthy of the name and offered limited lending and reference services. Naturally, these services and others were developed further when the new building opened in 1967, and it became possible to initiate new ones.

When the National Library was established 21 years ago, the library of the National Research Council was already about 30 years old. It was agreed that the existing science collections would not be duplicated in the National Library, which would build its collections in the humanities, the arts and the social sciences. Other strong collections would not be duplicated either, such as those of the Department of Agriculture or the Geological Survey of Canada. The limited funds available for acquisitions were accordingly used at the outset to begin to establish strong collections only in Canadian subjects, bibliography and general reference works.

Thus, to sum up, at the time it moved into the new building seven years ago, the National Library was collecting books in a limited way, producing the national bibliography (except for sound recordings and maps), and maintaining union catalogs for monographs, periodicals and newspapers.

After 15 years of modest beginnings, and in the light of the increasing needs of a growing research community and of the advent of new technology which facilitates the development of networks, the time had come to re-examine the role of the National Library. This was done and in 1969 Parliament adopted a new National Library Act which confirmed the original mission of the Library, provided for the continuation of all existing functions, but also strengthened considerably the powers and duties of the National Librarian, both at the federal and at the national levels. Section 7 (2) of the new Act provides that:

> Subject to the direction of the Governor in Council, the National Librarian may coordinate the library services of departments, branches and agencies of the Government of Canada including (a) the acquisition and cataloging of books; (b) the supply of professional advice, supervision and personnel; and (c) the provision of modern information storage and retrieval services including photocopying and microfilming services, electronic and other automated data processing services and facsimile or other communication of information services.

In other words the coordination of all aspects of library services at the federal government level is now the statutory responsibility of the National Librarian.

Owing to the federal framework within which we operate, it obviously was not possible for the central government to provide for such statutory coordinating powers on a nationwide basis; all that is possible here is voluntary cooperation between libraries subject to various levels of government as well as private libraries, and this is now facilitated by the new act. Section 8 provides that: "The National Librarian may, on terms and conditions approved by the Minister, enter into agreements with libraries and library and educational associations and institutions in and outside Canada" in respect of all library services referred to in the previous section. This was a prerequisite to the development of cooperative schemes as parts of a decentralized nationwide library network. I believe that a great deal more can and will be achieved by voluntary cooperation, although one must have a great deal of determination and, at times, patience.

It would have been futile to provide the National Librarian with such powers and to assign to him such duties had the government not been prepared to increase the human and financial resources required to do the job. This was also gradually ensured; in the last six years, the staff has grown from some 200 to some 500, and the budget from $1,600,000 to $7,300,000. What is significant, however, is that these resources have not been increased at such a rate in order to enable the National Library to do a great deal more of the same, but with a view to making it possible to initiate and develop a much more ambitious and diversified program and to exercise national leadership in many ways. All parts of the establishment were considerably strengthened, existing branches were reorganized, new offices were created, the active cooperation of other libraries and librarians was sought and obtained, all of which made it possible to attempt to meet the challenge of the seventies.

All that is possible for me to do here is to give a bird's eye view of the main developments of recent years and of our current services, projects and involvements. To do so chronologically would lead only to confusion; I shall accordingly divide the rest of my presentation into the general areas of (1) collections development and rationalization of research collections; (2) lending and reference services; (3) development of systems and coordination of networks.

On the subject of collections I shall be brief. I already mentioned that we are gradually building collections in the humanities, the arts and the social sciences. The Book Purchase Account has grown from $140,000 at the time of the move to the new building to the current $639,000 and, though still very modest, it makes possible, together with the legal deposit regulations and a series of exchange agreements, to expand the acquisitions program in new directions, especially literature, music, history, economics, philosophy and religion, and government documents both in the original and in microforms, sound recordings and manuscripts and literary papers. The number of periodicals now received is some 16,000, compared to less than 5,000 seven years ago. All told, the collection grows at the rate of more than 100,000 titles a year and we are now able to lend from our collection one item in four of those we are asked to locate through the Canadian union catalog. This is still unsatisfactory, but the percentage increases every year.

It was, and still is, difficult for the National Library of Canada to establish a sound, comprehensive acquisitions policy which would ensure that the limited funds available are used to meet priority needs. We accordingly initiated a series of surveys of collections to determine where and what were the strengths, the weaknesses and the gaps and we have published a detailed quantitative analysis of Research Collections in Canadian Libraries, starting with university libraries. In press is a volume on the collections of the federal libraries. We also conduct special studies such as Theatre Resources in Canadian Libraries, which will be followed next year with similar surveys covering law, then music, and so on. These surveys do not only reveal where the resources are; our hope is that they will make it easier for libraries to rationalize their own collections and to better coordinate their respective policies. There is no counterpart in Canada of the decentralized Farmington Plan nor of the centralized NPAC, but there is a growing realization of the need for some sort of a cooperative plan in order to avoid the unnecessary duplication of little-used material. Canada is still a country so poor in books that we cannot very well hope to make up for the time lost unless we agree to pool our resources, and it would appear that nothing short of a nationwide plan could ensure the maximum benefits to be derived from the money we invest collectively in the acquisition and cataloging of research collections. It is my hope that the recently established Collections Department Branch will exercise the necessary leadership here. It combines under one director, (1) the selection and acquisitions operations, (2) the gifts and exchange office, (3) the resources survey division, and (4) the recently reorganized Canadian Book Exchange Center which receives, lists and re-distributes to Canadian libraries hundreds of thousands of surplus items. We now have a well organized structure to coordinate these activities.

As to lending and reference services, they improve gradually as our collections grow, and as the union catalogs become more comprehensive and are better maintained. Last year, our staff lent over 110,000 items, answered more than 50,000 reference questions and handled more than 125,000 requests to locate items in the union catalogs. These catalogs grow by more than 1,600,000 cards a year, that is some 6,500 cards per day. It is interesting to know that some 80% of the requested titles are located in the catalogs and are held in Canada; that more than 50 percent of all our requests come by telex. One hundred seventy six libraries in Canada are linked to each other by telex, and 13 are also equipped with TWX, which shows the importance of fast communication. Few are happy with the speed of postal services, and the university libraries of Ontario and Quebec respectively operate a daily motorized delivery system - the National Library serves as the transfer point between the two systems - so that interlibrary loans between the university libraries of the two largest provinces are normally received within 48 hours. All told, the total of requests received, answered or redirected to appropriate sources increased by some 25 percent last year over the previous one, and this constant increase taxes the staff to the limit.

Our aim is to disseminate faster information which is more complete and better tailored to the needs of individual users.

Now that we have consolidated most of our general services, we have, accordingly, started to create special divisions headed by subject specialists in order to provide more sophisticated services in certain fields. We now have a Music Division, which in some four years has developed one of the best collections in the country. Specialized services will soon be established for law, the theatre, children's books, the visually and physically handicapped, and more will come later. A Library Documentation Centre was also established to acquire, analyze and distribute published and unpublished reports on libraries and information science, and to publish library directories. It is also the Canadian correspondent for Unesco's ISORID (International Information System on Research in Documentation). The Reference Branch also offers a current awareness service in the humanities and the social sciences, which is an integral part of the CAN/SDI service developed at the National Science Library, about which Jack Brown will have more to say later. Using the software developed by the NSL to offer SDI services in the field of science and technology, our service now alerts users to recent publications covered by three tape services: LC's MARC II, ERIC and SSCI. We will add soon the Canadiana tapes and Psychological Abstracts, and more tapes will be added gradually. Plans are also under way to institute an on-line retrieval service which will permit computer-assisted dialogue via a CRT terminal with this central system. We have also established recently a Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, a central bibliography file, and the Multilingual Biblioservice which will make available to ethnic groups, through public and regional libraries in all provinces, collections of books in non-official languages both for educational and entertainment purposes. In order to be able to develop existing programs and to launch new ones, the Reference Branch, the largest in the Library, was completely reorganized and three senior coordinators were appointed, one for public services, one for union catalogs, and one for special services.

A similar reorganization will be effected soon in the Cataloging Branch, the second largest, which is responsible not only for the cataloging and classification of our growing collection (we have developed our own classed catalog with a bilingual index), but also for the production of the national bibliography, Canadiana (a monthly publication cumulated annually, which listed last year 25,431 Canadian titles, fully cataloged, English and French publications in their respective languages, bilingual publications in both languages, classified according to both LC and Dewey, with subject headings, ISBNs and our internal acquisition number).

Part I, the Monographs part of Canadiana, is fully automated and we are testing the processing format for serials. Next year, all parts, monographs, serials, and official publications will be automated, with the exception of audio-visual material which will come a year later. A card service is available and the Canadiana data base is the only one we know of which can be queried in both English and French. This bilinguality of our MARC format is attracting attention elsewhere; for instance in South America for it could provide transcoding from Spanish to Portugese, and vice versa, and since most of you are Americans, the State Library of Alaska whose Librarian wrote to me to have it so that they may study its applicability to English and Eskimo, which LC's MARC format does not provide for. The Canadiana base was designed with a view to generate on request a series of by-products for both bibliographic and managerial purposes.

As mentioned earlier, the Cataloging Branch is also responsible for the inventory of Canadian theses and their microfilming. More recently, a Retrospective Bibliography Division was created, charged with the responsibility of producing the complete bibliography of all Canadian imprints from the introduction of printing in this country in 1752 to the establishment of Canadiana in 1950, so that there may eventually be available a complete record of Canadian publications of all types. The Cataloging Branch is also responsible for providing the Canadian input into the International Serials Data System (ISDS) in Paris, and I think that I can say without being accused of complacency that we are now well prepared to play our role for UBC (Universal Bibliographic Control).

In order to prepare for these improvements in our reference and bibliographic services, and to exercise leadership in the country, it was necessary to take a number of new steps. With a view to expediting and extending to all disciplines the surveys of collections and to keeping them up to date, the staff of the Resources Survey Section was increased from two to six and the National Librarian participated in the work of the AUCC (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada) task group on library coordination, which examined problems and made recommendations regarding the rationalization of research, training and library programs (Quest for the Optimum, 1972). If we are to achieve a high level of sharing of bibliographic material and data, it is no less imperative to attempt to standardize systems, and since the Canadian Union Catalog is the by-product of the work done in many libraries, it was and is impossible for us to computerize its compilation and use unless a large measure of standardization is achieved in respect of both input and output procedures. The proposed national bibliographic data bank will be the central node of whatever configuration of national library network is developed; it was accordingly essential to involve the library community of the country in the study, planning and development of our programs.

I cannot go into details, but I must mention that in the Fall of 1968, I appointed a small team to identify the main problems and to study the potential benefits of an integrated information system which could encompass all bibliographic operations. The report recommending An

Integrated Information System for the National Library was completed in 1970 and its basic recommendations were accepted. In order to conduct on a library-wide basis the operational research required for the development of our system and to coordinate network planning with other libraries, a Research and Planning Branch was established in 1970 and the small initial establishment of ten has now grown to close to 25 librarians and systems analysts. Working in close cooperation with the operating branches, the Research and Planning Branch provides continuing support to task groups and study teams appointed to solve problems, is responsible for the coordination of all such efforts, be they internal, federal, national or international.

Since participants in a communications network require a common language, a national conference on cataloging standards was called and held at the National Library in 1970 and, as recommended, I subsequently appointed two task groups; one on Cataloging Standards, the other on a Canadian MARC format. Their recommendations, contained in two excellent reports, Cataloguing Standards (1972) and Canadian MARC (1972) were generally accepted and have been or are being implemented, at least as far as the National Library is concerned. The resulting MARC format for monographs was published and distributed and is being either tested or used by a number of Canadian libraries. For those who cannot afford as detailed analysis as the full MARC format permits, we have developed recently a mini-MARC format which could be used by libraries for internal processing and/or for reporting to the proposed computerized Canadian union catalog. A MARC format for serials was also developed, and we hope to work on other categories of library materials soon. Now, all these formats are compatible with international standards and we are increasingly active in international standardization activities, especially through IFLA and ISO. Last year I established an Office of Library Standards charged with the responsibility of ensuring a continuing and consistent Canadian input into international efforts which are at times complementary and, as you know, frequently indulge in unnecessary duplication. The Office also provides the secretariat for the new working group WG6 of ISO/TC46 on bibliographic description. With a view to ensuring the participation of Canadian libraries, a Canadian Cataloging Committee was recently established and is chaired by the Director of the Office. The Office is also responsible for the development of modified LC classification schedules for Canadian literature, history and law, as well as of a list of Canadian subject headings, better suited to meet our needs.

Having received, considered and acted upon the recommendations of the task groups on cataloging standards and on a Canadian MARC format respectively, it was possible to establish the Task Group on the Canadian Union Catalog, which I did in the Fall of 1972. It is chaired by Basil Stuart-Stubbs and its mandate is to investigate the nature, scope, maintenance and use of the catalog on which a computer library network with international interfaces could be based. The Group was also asked to explore alternative methods of providing some of the services provided by the union catalog, such as, for instance, the establishment of a national lending library. In October 1973, after a full year of studies, discussions and consultations, the Task Group submitted a series of interim recommendations, including the closing off of the existing manual catalog, the publication in microform of the existing file to provide locations of older material, and the establishment and coordination by the National Library of a Canadian union catalog system, consisting of a central data base and a number of regional bibliographic centers capable of providing information on holdings as well as cataloging support services and other services of bibliographic or managerial nature; and the rationalization of the development of union lists.

The National Library is in basic agreement with the main recommendations, and through contractual and internal studies is working towards their implementation. The recommendations and my response were published in a special issue of the National Library News (January 1974), copies of which are available to you here. The principal studies in question are the Serials Data Base Study contracted with York University, which is at the origin of the CONSER project (we are naturally gratified to see that what was contemplated at first as a Canadian project is taking a North American dimension); the National Bibliographic Data Base Study directed by Mr. Roderick Duchesne of the British Library and just completed, which describes a model illustrating the organization and content of the proposed central data bank of machine-readable bibliographic records and the means by which this may interface with other national or international data bases and machine-readable tape services, as well as strategies which could be followed in the development of the system over the next five years and its possible use as a Canadian on-line cataloging service based on a variety of tape services. (Incidentally, it is our hope that this may serve as a model for other nations which may wish to translate UBC into a practical domestic program); a third one, to be conducted by the University of British Columbia, will examine interlibrary loans as related to the development of a national information network: procedures, communications and delivery systems, national lending collections and distribution of costs. Naturally, we are aware of studies conducted in the U.S. and elsewhere, and we will be most interested in tomorrow's discussion of the ARL studies, from which we naturally learn a lot. We must, however, conduct similar separate studies in Canada where the resources are so much smaller and distributed differently on a geographical and institutional basis, where the needs differ, and so on.

Several other studies on related problems are under way, either internally or by contract; they are too numerous to be listed here. I shall mention two, however, contracted to Western Ontario and Guelph Universities, which are of special significance: one is related to the feasibility of using the Guelph Documents System (a simplified digital numerical code which permits retrieval of documents by author, title or subject) as a cooperative system for two or more libraries and its relation to a MARC formatted data base; the other, to examine the interface between a library using a manual system and a library using an automated system, and the interface between two automated libraries, one using a full MARC record, the other a simplified one. We are all becoming increasingly aware of the many difficult technical problems facing us when we attempt to develop networks in this age of transition, and the jurisdictional, legal, administrative and financial ones are certainly not any easier to solve.

It is not going to be easy to develop an integrated library network even at the federal level where I have statutory authority. A Canadian Government Library Committee was appointed to obtain the advice of federal colleagues, and a Government Libraries Liaison Office established. Its first main task was the direction of the comprehensive survey of federal government libraries, which was recently concluded with the submission of four final reports which total some 1,100 pages and make no less than 156 recommendations directed at the National Library, other central agencies, and federal libraries across Canada. These recommendations relate to (1) the rationalization and coordination of collecting activities throughout the government library system; (2) the major legislation, regulations and procedures affecting the recruitment, employment, classification, and training of professional librarians in the public service; (3) the whole range of library services and the means by which they are offered, the different kinds of information sources and services found outside the library, for example computerized data banks, information analysis centers, and clipping services, all elements of an information system that can be coordinated for optimum use, through greater cooperation in processing and resource sharing among federal libraries; and (4) the existing organization and administration of the federal library service both in the National Capital area and in the regions. The Report makes a number of fundamental recommendations which, when implemented, will, I hope, make for a highly efficient network for the benefit of all. You will appreciate that there is no time to discuss them in any detail here.

I must mention, however, that the federal government has examined recently the use and misuse of computers in and by departments and agencies and has adopted a new policy which provides for the establishment and operation of a few dedicated government-wide computer centers, one of them for libraries and information retrieval services whose custodian is to be the National Librarian. We are currently working out a program for the translation of this policy into action and my hope is that the Center will be operational late this year or early next year. It will be an effective tool to standardize library operations and to permit the maximum sharing of information resources at the federal level. It may possibly serve as a model for other cooperative systems, it will in any case be a major component of the larger nationwide network which, I still hope, may result from the collective efforts of many.

There are all sorts of other activities in which we are involved for we are subjected to pressures from many directions. Few, however, appreciate fully the magnitude and the complexity of the task ahead of us, or should I say, on top of us. The puzzle which we are attempting to assemble contains far more pieces than most of those who are at times impatient with us have to sort. Several members of my staff tax their energies to the limit and, if I remain confident when I attempt to take stock of all our initiatives, it is only because I know that I can count on their dedication, skill and imagination.

Some time ago, I was told that we received a frantic telephone call from Malton Airport. A flight from Thailand had deposited a Thai elephant on Malton and its destination was the Lakeland Regional Park. "Where is the Park?" the voice asked. "We have to get the thing out of here!" Well, the National Library of Canada is still, by U.S. standards, a small elephant, but it is growing bigger. We need an increasingly larger crew to look after him, for I have no intention to send him to Lakeland Regional Park. Elephants normally move slowly, and, if I may be personal, I would say that I am rather happy not to have to ride a much bigger animal. There is probably some virtue in being small, as well as in being young - we do not have to solve as yet many of the problems which result from mere bigness.

May I say in closing that we are anxious to maintain our contacts with library leaders in your country in order to benefit as fully as possible from significant developments there. We are increasing our contacts with library leaders in several other countries too. We must, however, find our own solutions to our own problems and we aim at building up our library resources and services to sufficient strength in most disciplines and to develop services tailored to our own needs. We are internationally minded, and it is no doubt vital for a smaller nation to act internationally as we Canadians do. We can only gain. My hope is that we should also be able to give something in return.

* * * *

THE NATIONAL SCIENCE LIBRARY AND ITS PROGRAM

Jack E. Brown
Librarian, National Science Library

MR. BROWN: The route by which the National Science Library (NSL) has reached its present state of existence has been tortuous and long, extending over a period of 50 years. I certainly have no intention of reviewing all of the informal agreements, the government decisions and the directives whereby the NSL has now reached its present posture and the various roles and responsibilities assigned to it. I think it is enough to say that the NSL had its beginning in 1924 as the Library of the National Research Council of Canada. As the National Science Library, it is still a division of NRC. The resources and services of this library kept pace with the development of the NRC to the point where the library was soon performing functions of a National Science Library. This de facto position was recognized informally in the first National Library Act of 1953 and more formally in 1966 through a revision of the NRC Act. This formal action was further strengthened in 1970 when, through a Cabinet directive, the NRC was assigned the responsibility for the development of a national scientific and technical information system. The system was to be decentralized wherein existing information organizations were to be utilized as fully as possible. The system was to be under the general direction of the National Librarian. The fact that all of these various acts and directives are not in harmony is now creating some very interesting problems for Dr. Sylvestre and me and the rest of those who are responsible for implementing national information services.

My purpose really is to outline to you the activities and services of the National Science Library as they exist today. I think I, like all of you who have worked in the information field most of our lives, have had no difficulty in recognizing that there is a vital relationship between the industrial, economic and social developments of a country and the ability of that country to channel the right information to the right person at the right time. I have therefore, been constantly amazed that the developed countries of the world have been slow to provide mechanisms whereby these goals can be achieved. Indeed, we have procrastinated so long in dealing with this problem that the job of processing the mass of existing information and the flow of new information has become a task of gigantic proportions.

Canada has been just as remiss in tackling this problem as any other country in the world. However, as I mentioned earlier, by reason of this directive of 1970, and as the result of a series of studies which Dr. Sylvestre referred to dealing with the establishment of scientific information policies, the federal government took steps to make up for lost time and laid down the ground rules for the development of a national STI system. The NSL, at the present time, is the major focal point, or coordinating agency for the existing STI system. Its resources have been developed and are continually being developed in close cooperation with all the major libraries in Canada, particularly with the National Library and the other federal libraries in Ottawa. These resources and services are designed to complement and supplement local resources, and also to provide the essential backup for the information services provided by the NSL's staff of information specialists and those of the NRC's Technical Information Service (TIS). In other words, the NSL is responsible for ensuring that scientists, engineers, technologists, research workers, managers, policy makers have ready access to any scientific and technical information required in their day-to-day work, regardless of whether the information or the publications they are seeking are held by the NSL or any other agency in Canada.

I think it is important to note that the National Science Library is not a library in the conventional sense of the word, but rather an "information transferral agency." It has no depository or archival responsibilities and its literature resources are acquired solely because they contain STI essential to the development of science and technology in Canada. Another point: unlike most other major libraries, except for mechanizing, for example, the recording and listing of series held by the NSL and related bibliographical activities, we have done very little to mechanize internal processing operations. Our prime concern has been to develop and implement new techniques to expedite and facilitate the retrieval and dissemination of what I could refer to as "evaluated or pedigreed scientific and technical information." I think it is correct to say that the NSL's total activities are user-oriented.

The STI system as it exists links and makes available nationally the major literature and information resources of a variety of agencies. This linking is accomplished at the present time by means of three basic networks. The first of these networks is a network of about 245 university, provincial and industrial libraries which up until now, through a variety of informal cooperative agreements make their resources available nationally primarily by means of loans and photocopies. The files of scientific and technical journals held by these libraries are linked by telex and by the National Science Library's computer-based Union List of Scientific Materials in Canadian Libraries. This union list is an on-line system which could be accessed by remote terminals, but at the moment this is still too costly, so we print it out. The fifth edition of this union list was published just last month, and I noted that it now records about 46,000 different titles held by Canadian libraries. As you well know, in the field of science and technology journals account for at least 80 percent of scientific and technical literature. This means that Canadian scientists and engineers have, through the NSL or through their local libraries, access to the major portion of the world's scientific and technical literature.

The second network within the system is one based on the Canadian Selective Dissemination of Information program, CAN/SDI. I do not think I need to say too much about this; you are all very familiar with SDI systems. I think maybe the outstanding feature of CAN/SDI is that it is a national service. It is a computer-based system which provides current awareness, and alerts subscribers to the existence of recent papers on various topics. At the present time we have 1,800 user profiles searched against 14 data bases to serve approximately 5,500 end users. While Dr. Sylvestre was speaking he mentioned these data bases, and it occurred to me I should note that of these 14 data bases, all but two of them are produced in the United States. So you see here is one way in which we are very dependent on what is happening in the U.S.A.

The CAN/SDI system became operational in 1969 after three years of experimentation and testing. If you are familiar with SDI, the system itself in Canada has been described in a great many papers so I am not going to go into it at any length. However, maybe I should make a note here of its main features. The 14 data bases which we use are each incompatible with the other as far as the format is concerned and very often as far as the type of equipment that is required. These are converted to a common Library of Congress MARC-like format. This technique enables the user to access any of the source tape with one interest profile, to switch from one tape to another and to tap the information content of several tapes without major changes in the search terms or the search logic. Also the NSL attempts to ensure that all papers cited in these tapes are available either at the NSL or other readily-accessible centers in Canada, and provides photocopies of cited papers not available through local sources. It is a completely useless exercise , of course, to provide a scientist or a researcher with a list of five or six papers which you tell him he must read, and then in the next breath say, "I'm sorry. The papers are not available in Canada." So we have tried to get around the problem.

Another interesting point is that the service is decentralized and one wherein search editors located in all parts of Canada serve as the interface between the system and the ultimate user. To date we have trained about 500 search editors; these people are located in industrial firms, universities, hospitals, government departments, research centers. These search editors are completely familiar with the CAN/SDI techniques and are knowledgeable in the subject fields of their clientele. To further strengthen this decentralized concept, the NSL has designated three agencies as output centers for the CAN/SDI services; for example, the Library of the Canadian Geological Survey is using the tapes and is responsible for interfacing with the geoscience community.

In all of these decentralized concepts, the NSL is responsible for all technical details relating to computer processing and negotiations with tape suppliers. The designated agencies are responsible for the construction of interest profiles and the meeting of users' needs. It may be of interest to you that UNESCO and UNICEF have asked us to make this CAN/SDI program available to UNESCO countries. To date we have established CAN/SDI type systems in Australia and South Africa. We are now about to set up a similar system in Argentina, and in India next fall. I think all this indicates that these developing countries are very much interested in a system which is working well in another developing country.

The third network in this national system, CANOLE, is Canadian On-Line Enquiry System. Again, this is a computerized system for interactive searching of large bibliographical data bases. It is an extension of CAN/SDI. However, unlike a batch system such as CAN/SDI, a conversational mode of operation permits our users to query directly via computer communications terminals, one or more data bases. A user may modify his literature search dynamically in response to replies received from the system until the search produces potentially a relevant citation. The main advantages, of course, are speed, direct user control, easy access to a variety of bibliographical files, through one device and one system. Again, I think the unusual feature of this is that it is a national system. It became operational only in February of this year, and it is very much an experimental project to test the validity and feasibility of accessing large data bases via remote terminals. We would like to know, for example, if there are a sufficient number of potential users who require rapid access to information and who are willing to pay the relatively high cost of this type of service. Also, why develop a Canadian on-line system when Canadians also have access to a large number of data bases via, for example, SDC's ORBIT or Lockheed's DIALOG? In other words, do use and cost justify a national on-line system?

As with CAN/SDI, before we implemented this on-line retrospective searching facility, we did a limited market survey to determine the extent of interest for such a system. The results indicated keen interest, in spite of the cost. The other factor which prompted us to go ahead with this on-line system was that communication costs for low-speed and digital data transmission have been reduced by about 80 percent with the introduction of Data Route and Info Dat. Data Route is a digital data network operated by the Trans-Canada Telephone System, and Info Dat, which is very similar, is operated by the CN/CP Telecommunications. To give you some idea of the reduction in cost, the line charges between Ottawa and Vancouver before the advent of Data Route were about $3,000 per month; they are now $300 per month, which makes an on-line system economically feasible.

Another thing that prompted us to go ahead was that through the use of CAN/SDI, we had built up over the last few years in machine-readable form over 4,000,000 references in all fields of science and technology. And again, we felt that Canadians should be given an effective alternative to similar developments in the U.S.A. with the ultimate goal of developing a strong national bibliographical network designed to meet present and future requirements.

Because of staff limitations and heavy use of the NRC computer which we are relying on now, the initial participation in this CANOLE system is limited to 15 centers. Each center pays a membership fee of $700 a month.

This basic fee covers all computer storage costs, digital file creation costs and provides up to 15 hours of unlimited searching time. If a center exceeds the 15 hours, they then pay $12 per connect hour. The centers are encouraged, of course, to charge for this service to their clientele in order to recover their own operating costs. At the present time we only have four data bases on-line: COMPENDEX, that is the Engineering Index, which is covered from 1969 to date; INSPEC, from 1970 to date (this is the equivalent of Science Abstracts); BA Previews, from 1973 to date and Chemical Abstracts CONDENSATES, 1973 to date.

In addition to serving as the focal point of these three networks and as a coordinator for the national SDI system, the NSL provides several accessory and coordinating services which are also national in scope. The NSL serves as the Health Sciences Resource Center, and as such, is responsible for coordinating and strengthening the relevant bibliographic resources of the country. The NSL operates as the MEDLARS center for Canada, and during this past year we have set up 10 MEDLINE centers which are operating independently. We are simply responsible for organizing and getting them going, but they access the MEDLINE data base via links in the United States. We publish a variety of tools to facilitate this use of the medical resources.

We have developed a computer-based information exchange center which facilitates the storage and retrieval of information relating to current research projects in universities as funded by the federal government. This is being extended; it is an on-line system. We are working under a contract for the Ministry of State for Science and Technology, and now have an online system which we call ISA, that is, an Inventory of Scientific Activities within the federal government. In other words it answers the questions, "Who is doing what research? Where? How much is this costing? Who is sponsoring it?" It is somewhat similar to the Science Information Exchange at the Smithsonian, only on a much smaller scale.

The NSL also serves as a national center for information on pollution and environmental control. We have developed a pollution data base, an online system, which covers the world's literature from September 1968, and to date contains about 60,000 citations.

To give you some idea of the size of our operation, in the provision of loans and photocopies we are now processing about 600 requests a day. We have a 36-hour response time; we guarantee that within 36 hours after the request has been received, the information will have been sent out. Of course, we have no control of what happens to it once it gets into the Canadian postal system.

Despite these promising developments, it is very evident that a large percentage of the potential users of SDI do not have ready access to information which is relevant and timely. Existing services are not well known and therefore not used to the maximum. There are frustrating delays in the delivery of needed documents and information. There has been the failure to recognize the strength of local resources and expertise and to tap them. These weaknesses in the information system are, in a large measure, inherent in the geographical and political nature of Canada. Steps are now being taken to overcome these constraints to progress by expanding the present system. One of the steps will be to bring a closer integration between the National Science Library and the NRC's Technical Information Service to form what might be called a Canadian Institute for Scientific and Technical Information. Concurrent with this action, we are planning to establish regional referral centers which will coordinate and make available total information resources and subject expertise in a given region.

The expansion of the NSL's activities has been severely hampered by inadequate working quarters. However in February of this year these space difficulties were overcome when we moved into an ultra-modern building which now houses the National Science Library and the NRC's Technical Information Service. This building has been 12 years in the planning and two and a half years in construction. It has been designed to house 2,000,000 volumes and to utilize all the latest mechanized techniques for processing and disseminating information. One floor is designed entirely for computerized operation and the building is so wired that terminals can be hooked in at any point in the building to put information into the computer and retrieve it. Since Keyes Metcalf is here, I cannot resist mentioning that here we have another input from the United States in that Mr. Metcalf has been consultant on this building. I certainly will give him all credit for this very unusual building.

* * * *

CANADIAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES AND LIBRARY ASSOCIATIONS

Dean Halliwell
University of Victoria

Last fall I accepted with alacrity an invitation from Bruce Peel to participate in the program he was then developing for this meeting. I had two basic motives; first, quite frankly, was the opportunity it presented me, as librarian of a smallish university, to participate somewhat more than vicariously in the counsels of the mighty, the big boys of academic librarianship; secondly, as a practising Canadian nationalist, although not on the extreme edges of that apparently proliferating breed, I welcomed the chance to improve the level of understanding of Canada among some of my fellow librarians. Somewhat shamefacedly, I must confess that in some measure my Canadian nationalism, like that of many of my countrymen, arises from a defensive feeling that the world outside our border, and in particular that important portion of it immediately south of our border, really does not know much about us. The more paranoid among us suspect that it does not really care. I hope they are wrong. I hope, too, that I can draw back the curtain at least a little for each of you, realizing that my self-assigned task is to improve your level of understanding, not to perfect it.

Bruce originally asked me to deal with "Canadian library organizations - their history, aims and achievements". Rashly, I agreed to do so within a 30 minute framework. Rashly, because the task on more sober reflection seemed somewhat akin to that which some future encyclopedist will face in summarizing the intricacies of Watergate in a couple of thousand words. Presumably, I would have some slight advantage, since I have had substantial personal involvement.

Subsequently Bruce made three changes. He reduced my time allotment from 30 to 20 minutes. Well, brevity supposedly is the soul of wit. Then he expanded the topic from library organizations by adding a request that I also discuss university libraries in Canada. Mercifully, his third action was to lighten the load by asking Rosario de Varennes to speak about the French fact in Canada. I will, therefore, restrict my discursive remarks to English-speaking Canada. And, rather perversely, I am going to talk less about libraries than about library organizations in Canada.

It is a fact that Canadian librarians are, if not well, or even thoroughly, at least generously, supplied with library organizations. As in so many aspects of our national existence, the pattern with which you are familiar is reflected here in Canada, in that there are national, regional and provincial associations of a general nature as well as groupings by special area of interest and, as well, organizations which have eschewed the term library or librarian.

So we have the Canadian Library Association, a regional association in the Maritime Provinces, provincial associations in all but two of the ten provinces, plus purely professional associations in three provinces. There are associations of music librarians, of map librarians and of law librarians, as well as of library educators and of information scientists. There are two chapters of the Special Libraries Association, as well as many individual members of SLA. Our medical librarians, oddly enough, have no association of their own but belong to MLA. Canadian membership in ALA is larger than that of many, if not most, of the states. Many British Columbia librarians are members of the Pacific Northwest Library Association, and the few librarians in the Yukon find a home in the Alaska Library Association, another example of library services crossing borders, as I discovered when, as President of CLA, I attended an AKLA conference in Whitehorse.

The national association into which is focussed the main interest and activity of Canadian librarians is, quite naturally, the Canadian Library Association. Only 29 years old, CLA is a postwar baby and, by comparison with the almost-centenarian ALA, still a stripling. But it does have some rather respectable accomplishments to its credit, foremost of which I suspect is that it has given Canadian librarians a national forum in which to discover their communities of interest and to submerge their regional or work-oriented interests. Four thousand members spread across 4000 miles is a trite but reasonably graphic way to describe CLA and to point up the need for a unifying force. And that it has been and will, I believe, continue to be even in its new organizational clothing, for with the adoption last year of a new constitution, it has become in large part a federation of five semi-autonomous associations representing academic, public, school and special libraries and library trustees.

Each of the five associations is responding vigorously to the opportunity afforded it by the reorganization which CLA has undergone in the past three or four years - a reorganization which has been much less traumatic than that through which ALA continues to struggle. I feel that one particularly significant and heartening aspect of the new structure of CLA is the direct involvement, for the first time, of the provincial and regional associations in its governing council. At a time when there is considerable pressure in ALA to disenfranchise chapter councillors, my opinion may seem surprising. It is based, however, on my conviction that, at least in the Canadian context, there is much to gain and little to lose in carrying over into librarianship a phenomenon of Canadian politics, the federal-provincial conference, with the intention of ensuring that all are working toward common goals and that, insofar as possible, their efforts are coordinated rather than duplicative.

This is particularly important now, when the thrust of so much activity among librarians is toward the development of consortia, networks and systems and when there is an increasing awareness and acceptance of the desirability of modulating individuality in the interests of closer interrelationships between all types of libraries. CLA has chosen as its conference theme for the meetings in Winnipeg next month "Canadian library systems and networks, their planning and development." Jack Brown reflecting the interest and leadership which he and Guy Sylvestre have brought to the cooperative solution of Canadian library problems on a national basis, is the coordinator of that program.

Somewhat more than parenthetically, I now add that this is only fair, for one of the first and foremost interests of CLA from its inception was to press for action by the Canadian government to establish a National Library. And Guy Sylvestre in particular will bear witness that the interest of the Association and of its constituent bodies has not waned in subsequent years. Briefs to the federal government or to the National Library or to both, are common results of the work of the Association's committees, and they more often than not get results, whether it is in the establishment of an Office of Canadian Library Resources, as recommended initially by Edwin Williams of Harvard and Robert Downs of Illinois, or the leadership undertaken by our national libraries in the fields of union lists, union catalogs and library automation projects.

Mention of Robert Downs affords me a logical progression from the parent association, CLA, to its academic component, the Canadian Association of College and University Libraries. As CLA is the equivalent of ALA, so CACUL is the equivalent of ACRL, with the advantage that the acronym is, if not euphonious, at least capable of pronunciation, and more than one librarian has observed that CACUL is perhaps only too appropriate a description for some of its meetings. CACUL is very much an infant, I suppose, having been born in 1963, but a lusty infant it has been and continues to be. Like many library associations, CLA was criticized for years, at least by academic librarians, for being overly concerned with public library affairs and dominated by public librarians. CACUL's birth coincided with the very considerable expansion of Canadian universities in the early sixties and its attentions and activities have centered more or less consistently on ensuring that academic libraries receive due consideration in that period of almost explosive growth.

One of CACUL's first substantial endeavors was to endorse Edwin Williams' findings that, with few exceptions, Canada's university libraries were ill-equipped to cope with the demands that the sixties were certain to bring. Robert Blackburn was largely instrumental in spelling out the costs that any reasonable progress toward adequacy would involve. Early in its existence, CACUL had the foresight to become the official library arm of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, the organization of its parent institutions. And it was joint sponsorship by CACUL and AUCC that resulted in the greatly expanded second survey of Canadian academic libraries in 1966 and 1967 by a team which was led by Robert Downs and included Bruce Peel. The Downs Report became in large part the blueprint for academic library development in the later sixties.

Another substantial CACUL achievement was the publication in 1964, of its set of qualitative and quantitative standards for university libraries, which established or reiterated some useful and important benchmarks which I, and many of my colleagues, have used to good purpose. Unfortunately, a project to develop revised standards ran into heavy going some three years ago, in large part, I believe, because the task was entrusted mainly to theoreticians from the ranks of library educators rather than to more practically-minded practitioners. But there is progress afoot; a new committee is at work and new standards can be expected.

I mentioned that CLA and its constituent parts have a substantial history of presenting briefs to governments. One area in which CACUL has been concerned and active has been the thorny one of copyright, for the problems and uncertainties in Canada are in many ways parallel to those in the United States. Basil Stuart-Stubbs has been particularly active and effective in gathering and presenting factual data to counter the arguments of publishers and authors that the photocopying practices of university libraries are an abomination and a stench in the nostrils of the godly. And, as another indicator that there is really no new thing under the sun, in noting that your sessions tomorrow are concerned with interlibrary loans, I am reminded that Robert Blackburn has been a persuasive and witty writer on that topic and that CLA, in conjunction with our national libraries, was instrumental in developing telex procedures for use in interlibrary loan activities, procedures which have received wide acceptance.

In turning briefly to a look at Canadian university libraries, I will bridge the transition from the overview of library organizations by mentioning that CACUL, as part of the reorganization recently effected by CLA, has itself set up three groups of institutional members with relatively common interests. One is composed of the libraries of two-year institutions, a relatively new phenomenon in Canada but one which has mushroomed in the past decade as most provinces have established community colleges, regional colleges, or whatever term the particular jurisdiction may have chosen. Numbering in the dozens, these institutions are for the most part small in student numbers, few exceeding a couple of thousand students in programs that are more commonly vocational or technical than academic in nature. The large American junior college is not as yet a common phenomenon in Canada.

Nor does the Canadian scene reflect the great number and variety of four-year institutions to be found in the United States. There are barely 50 degree-granting institutions in Canada; with few exceptions they are called universities and, equally commonly, they are provincially supported, in the sense that the major portion of their funds (aside from student fees, which represent on average perhaps 15 percent of total revenues) from the provincial government. Under the Canadian constitution (and I will add, parenthetically, that I am completely incompetent to answer questions as to why that rather evanescent document is in fact an act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom) under our constitution, education is a provincial responsibility and, since the concept of "states' rights" is not altogether unknown here, federal funds cannot flow directly to Canadian universities. This, of course, spares us the pain of having an administration cut back or cut out appropriated funds. And, with typical Canadian resourcefulness, our federal government does transfer substantial funds to the provinces by a carefully calculated formula, with everyone understanding that these are to be used in support of universities, but nobody being so gauche as to say so. As you might guess, it is called revenue-sharing.

To get back to our 50-odd universities, CACUL has established a pecking order on more or less arbitrary lines, at least insofar as their libraries are concerned. The two university groups within CACUL are known as the Small Universities Section and CARL. CARL might with some logic be understood to stand for the Canadian Association of Research Libraries; that does have a familiar sound. In reality, however, it identifies the Canadian Academic and Research Libraries. I can better explain the inclusion of the word Research, which paved the way for membership by the National Library and the National Science Library than I can that of Academic, which has the perhaps unfortunate connotation that only the larger universities have that distinction. The dividing line, incidentally, is not size of student population, but the offering of a suitable number and variety of doctoral programs. In addition to the national libraries, CARL now includes 26 institutions, of which our afternoon's host, Toronto, is largest, and my own, Victoria, is among the smallest. Ten CARL institutions are in Ontario, five in Quebec, five in the three prairie provinces, three in the Atlantic provinces and three in British Columbia. Together they serve some 280,000 students, of whom some 40,000 are in graduate programs, the remainder in undergraduate and professional programs. In 1973/74 those libraries had budgets of about $75,000,000, with expenditures on salaries representing slightly over 60 percent and on acquisitions and binding slightly over 30 percent. They employed nearly 1,400 professional and 4,500 supporting staff, figures which had changed relatively little in the past couple of years as stationary or declining enrollments and budget restrictions brought an end to an era of rapid expansion.

As tighter budgets came in with the seventies, Canadian academic libraries turned with greater urgency and, in some instances at least, under the hot breath of governmental scrutiny and pressure, to investigation of an involvement in projects of a cooperative nature. I think that the instincts toward cooperation and coordination were there anyway, but they received greater impetus as expansion gave way to a standstill status. The 14 provincial universities in Ontario have what is undoubtedly the most formal organization in English-speaking Canada, and some of the most significant developments and proposals have originated here: the interlibrary loan network, the experimental computer-based cataloging system which we outlanders are led to believe resides in the bowels of the Robarts Library, the University of Guelph's widely copied method of handling government publications. But, as a native westerner who finds it difficult still to believe that any good can come from Ontario, let me hasten to add that there are cooperative stirrings in the prairie provinces as well, under the aegis initially of the Council of Western Canadian University Libraries (a beautiful acronym, COWCUL, coined by that old cowpoke, Bruce Peel) and more recently under the Council of Prairie University Libraries, the less euphonious COPUL.

I hesitate to mention that COWCUL became COPUL through the defection of British Columbia's three musketeers, but I must fact facts and acknowledge the grain of truth in the suggestion that, in reality, the lotus-eaters west of the Rocky Mountains are perhaps the most separatist of all Canadians. And so I come to TRIUL, or the Tri-University Libraries of the University of British Columbia, Simon Fraser University and the University of Victoria, with its semi-annual retreats to a Vancouver Island resort and its hard-working and productive committees and task forces. We have come a long and cooperative way from the sunny afternoon some six or eight years ago when Basil Stuart-Stubbs, Don Baird, and I, met over two or three or maybe more bottles in the Halliwells' backyard and talked cooperation. But that is another story.

And, since I have carefully refrained from mentioning La Belle Province, I am not really sure that I have mentioned much of consequence. Let me now make way for Rosario de Varennes.

* * * *

FRENCH-LANGUAGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES AND THEIR PROBLEMS
OR
SOME DIFFICULTIES OF LIVING IN FRENCH IN NORTH AMERICA

Rosario de Varennes
Universite Laval

Introduction

It is quite appropriate to discuss such a topic at the exact time when the Government of Quebec Province - or shall we say State - is about to introduce into the Legislative Assembly the most crucial and debatable bill of recent years concerning the status of French language in that enclave of North America. I would not dare be so presumptuous as to express before you a personal opinion in that matter. On the other hand, I must say I am happy to have such a nice opportunity to convey to English-speaking Canadian and American colleagues some of our real life problems, not in order to draw some kind of pity or condescension from you, nor to lure you with a scent of live folkloric or exotic fragrance, but rather to try to convince you of the inescapable multicultural environment we live in today, even in North America, and maybe to offer you some hints at practical solutions beyond linguistic barriers.

Difficulty of staff recruitment and replacement

One basic difficulty relates to professional staff recruitment and replacement. The difficulty is compounded by various factors: scarcity of French population, existence of only one accredited library school giving instruction in French (in fact the only French library school accredited by ALA), the relatively recent development of scientifically organized French university library collections, the recent emergence of French librarians as truly professional people. In fact we are in no better position than the other North American librarians for that matter, except that since May 1969 we enjoy by public law the status of professional librarians organized in a corporation - the Corporation of Professional Librarians of Quebec. I must add here that, as far as associations are concerned, the new corporation is rapidly becoming the real instrument of promotion of the profession in the Province, a goal never attained by the other general or related associations like the Quebec Library Association (QLA), l'Association canadienne des bibliothecaires de langue francaise (ACBLF), recently superseded by l'Association pour l'avancement des sciences et techniques de la documentation (ASTED inc.), the Quebec Chapter of the Canadian Association for Information Science (CAIS), the Montreal Chapter of Special Libraries Association.

The impact of the situation bears not so much at the level of current openings in lower grades - in fact new graduates are faced with a paucity of job offerings due to so widely spread drastic cuts in public moneys for university library budgets. Rather the real difficulty consists in the development of a sufficient pool of expertise to fill adequately key positions and provide the needed brain potential to conceive new ideas and systems. You must realize that one condition of such expertise in the present context implies the possibility of easily communicating with other North American experts in the field, because the French counterpart expertise from Europe is still limited and often not adapted to local conditions. On the other hand, the French-Canadian expert must struggle with his mother-tongue and even create neologisms to express adequately the new realities of librarianship, especially in the fields of information science and library automation, and try to keep abreast of new French vocabulary developed in the mother country.

The fact is unfortunately that such prominent French-Canadian librarians are still very few and consequently they live a very stressing professional career being divided between pressing needs at their local institutions and at the national level and being called upon to sit on too numerous committees and working groups. Also a certain imbalance between local institutions may result from the concentration of some of these persons in one place.

Acquisition of documentation

A similar phenomenon prevails concerning the availability of library material in French. As you may well know, the literature published in French, especially in science and technology, is indeed minimal compared to English output, and that is critical for an institution like Laval University for example where most of scientific textbooks are American even though the teaching is given in French. Another factor is higher prices for French books, except maybe for general literature. Save that intrinsic difficulty of the French book trade, there is no special problem of acquisition proper but the rather slow traffic between Europe and Canada and even Montreal and Quebec City, and also, more stringent, the recent provincial legislation forcing libraries to buy only through accredited local book dealers. This explains the recent proliferation in Montreal of Quebec owned subsidiaries of most of the large European and American book dealers. There exist also various ways of circumventing the law; for example accreditation of local university presses. The intent of the orders-in-council was to promote the local literary production, mostly French-Canadian, and to protect it against the invasion of the American literary deluge, and also to reinforce the economic condition of local book dealers.

These aims were achieved in some way, as can be judged by the promotional literature currently issued, most of it machine-generated from the international French data base of France Expansion, viz.: Répertoire de l'édition au Québec, Répertoire des livres et matériels d'enseignment disponibles, Choix de titres canadiens en langue française, Vient de paraître, etc. - but in many instances to the detriment of library budgets.

Processing of library material

Doubtless, it is in the area of technical services where the necessity of living in French imposes the most strenuous and costly efforts. The intellectual task involved may be summarized in a very simple statement: the provision of cataloging information in French, or the provision in French of a bibliographic and conceptual approach to the existing literature, taking into account as far as possible accepted national and international standards. That means in concrete terms the elaboration of name and subject authority files incorporating equivalences, the adoption of appropriate transliteration tables, the adaptation of cataloging and filing rules, etc. In that connection, it is worth mentioning the publication in August 1973 of the French version of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, North American edition, prepared jointly by ACBLF and a French counterpart and officially launched during IFLA meeting at Grenoble, France. Also it is worth noting the agreement passed between the National Library of Canada and Laval University Library aimed at concerting the latter's computerized List of Subject Headings in French into a national standard and at complementing it by automatic cross references from French to English and vice versa. In fact, the Laval "repertoire" is already widely used throughout the world French library community. For example inside the data bank of France Expansion, and since January 1974 it is the only source for French headings in Canadiana, the Canadian national bibliography.

One drawback though of utilizing French variants for main and added entries is the almost impossibility, at least in a manual environment, to take full advantage of existing products like LC proofslips or cards or microfiches even when they refer to French books; hence additional costs and delays in processing. Curiously enough the advent of library automation, especially in an on-line environment, seems to offer better possibilities. First hints at these multipartite or multilingual combinations inside data banks came from Europe, we must confess, with BNB, MARC and MONOCLE or first version of French MARC, for example, but were readily incorporated into the Canadian MARC Project to answer peculiar bilingual needs of the Canadian library community. Recently, a group of Quebec and Ontario universities jointly launched an on-line shared cataloging project similar to OCLC but geared to specific Canadian needs and will try to bring to fruition this conceptual design. Another exercise in the same vein consists in elaborating search strategies using French or English terms to access various data banks and provide SDI services, examples being CAN/OLE at the National Science Library and VIBANQ/VIBANQUE (computerized information retrieval system on mechanical vibration) at Laval University; I could propose some other live occurences of bilingual treatment achieved by computer processing. Here I must take the opportunity to praise both National Libraries and their respective directors, Mr. Sylvestre and Mr. Brown, for their indefatigable efforts to answer the needs of the French-Canadian minority of the country. Also I would like to convey to the director of the University of Toronto Library, Mr. Blackburn, the gratefulness of Quebec university libraries participating in the OULCS Monograph Demonstration Project for the machine support offered the project in the Robarts Library and their hope that the Toronto system staff will do even the impossible to guarantee the full success of the operation.

To conclude I might say that, everything considered, the cultural reality of living in French in North America amounts to a very appealing challenge we feel French-Canadian librarians have pretty well taken up so far.

* * * *

COMMISSION ON CANADIAN STUDIES

T. H. B. Symons
Commission on Canadian Studies

MR. SYMONS: It may be of special interest, but it is also especially difficult, to speak on the subject of the work of the Commission on Canadian Studies to this group. Perhaps the most useful way to commence would be to look briefly at the terms of reference of the Commission. The Commission was established some 20 months ago by the 70 universities of Canada through the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada with the support of the Canada Council and, to a lesser degree with the support of the Science Council, to study and to report upon the state of teaching and research in studies relating to Canada at Canadian universities.

There were eight terms of reference:

1) to report upon the course content offered at the graduate and undergraduate levels in the various fields of study relating to Canada;

2) to look at formally designated programs of Canadian studies;

3) to look at the location and extent of library holdings and other resources and materials relevant to Canadian studies and also to examine the degree of ready access to these materials;

4) to look at the adequacy of financial support for teaching and research throughout this country;

5) to look at the opportunity of support for research;

6) to examine requirements for personnel, the future needs of the country and also the orientation of people engaged in teaching and research in Canada. (There is a good deal of concern in Canada, particularly in the university community, about the question of whether or not our universities are being assimilated into a continental North American point of view. This is reflected at the university staffing level by the concern as to whether or not there is too high a proportion of non-Canadian university staff and, in particular, staff members from the neighboring country. It is a very delicate question, and yet it is one that the Commission has been asked to examine.

7) to look at the possibilities for new programs relating to Canada;

8) any other related matters.

You might wonder why such a Commission has been established and I think it undoubtedly relates to the growth of national feeling in the country, and perhaps also a growth of regional feeling, including a very special feeling in the province of Quebec, but also in other regions. It may well be that the province of British Columbia is the most separatist in the nation.

I think that the Commission has been created really in response to deeper and more valid concerns than simply an excess of Canadian national feeling, though I do not discount the propriety of a reasonable degree of concern about our national interests. The essential reason, I think, for the creation of the Commission has been a very real concern amongst the academic community itself and amongst the wider Canadian public, as to whether or not our universities are paying an adequate amount of attention to the particular needs and particular opportunities of our own country in programs of teaching and research. I think this is a valid question and one that merits exploration. The Commission's report will be, I hope, a thoughtful exploration of educational questions conducted in academic terms and not an exercise in flag-waving.

The Commission's work has proceeded in three broad phases; the first phase, or public phase, involved an invitation for briefs, the holding of public hearings in every part of the country, a great many formal and informal consultations and a vast amount of correspondence. The response to the public phase was extraordinary, both from within the academic community and the wider public community, and it made unmistakably clear that there really is tremendous interest and concern across the entire country about the matters upon which the Commission has been asked to report. The Commission held some 50 public hearings; it has received some 12,000 letters; and it has received now towards 1,000 briefs, which is a simply phenomenal response for a university commission in a still comparatively small country.

The second phase, which proceeded at the same time, involved the research and staff work by the Commission itself. I have been very fortunate indeed in the wonderful assistance that I had with this aspect of the Commission's work. A good deal of particularly careful research work was needed of a rather special sort, because the Commission is dealing with questions and issues on many of which there are strong differences of opinion. These differences of opinion extend to disagreements as to what are the facts in the case. Beyond this and more significant, there are a good many deep differences in values and backgrounds, traditions, points of view, cultural situations which the Commission must examine and on which it must report, these differences are probably irreconcilable, even when there is a great deal of goodwill. Thus, the Commission on Canadian Studies has been asked to report and to make recommendations upon a highly complex and sensitive area of academic and public concern. In this difficult situation, as you will appreciate, good research plays a key role.

The final phase of the Commission's work, which I am glad to report to you is the one which we are now in, is the writing of the report. This is now well advanced; I hope that it will be completed by the end of June. It will be published in both our country's official languages in September.

The outline of the Commission's report* is as follows: The introduction will provide an overview and identify themes, report on the work and objectives of the Commission, and comment briefly on some of the problems that we have encountered.

Chapter 3, "The Rationale for Canadian Studies," is an important chapter, and the need for such a chapter may be one that would interest our colleagues from the United States. The fact of the matter is that it is necessary still in this country to establish the fact that it is legitimate and academically respectable, not chauvinistic simply, to have a thoughtful interest in research and teaching questions related to our own society. There has been almost a tradition that it is slightly bad form to express too actively an interest in Canadian research questions, in Canadian literature (as opposed to other literature), in Canadian social situations (as opposed to problems on the east side of New York), in resource economics (it has always been more respectable to look at the problems of Uganda than of the Yukon). One of the tasks of the Commission is to provide a rationale, an academic framework, a philosophical base which makes clear the academic legitimacy of a proper degree of concern in a scholarly way about one's own society. This has to be done in the face of a good deal of skepticism, a good deal of indifference and frankly, a good deal of academic snobbery.

The next 8 chapters, from 4 to 12, are really data base chapters. They are designed to provide an overview of what is and what is not going on in this country at the university level involving teaching and research about Canada. It has been approached by the Commission with, I think, few or no preconceptions. We are looking, essentially, for an awareness factor. We want to know if some appropriate degree of attention is being given to the Canadian context and content of teaching and research when it is appropriate to do so. Is there some reasonable degree of attention being given to Canadian problems, materials, examples? While our findings indicated that there is a great deal going on, there are frankly, frequent and very large gaps, sometimes of quite glaring extent, of neglected opportunity, neglected needs, in terms of research and teaching about our own country.

There is a danger, I think, when one talks about Canadian content in university curricula, not only of chauvinism, but a danger of tokenism. At a time when there is a rising feeling of national awareness in the country, it is a very easy and tempting thing for universities to offer courses that they label rather flamboyantly as Canadian studies or Canadian something-or-other, without adequate attention to the content and to the standards. I think this is a situation that may have occurred in regard to some of the Black Studies programs, for example, that have been put together pretty quickly. All of our societies have examples of this. So that I think one has to approach with caution the question of Canadian content. The test is not what labels there are; the test is the reality of the content. I think the reading list is likely to be a far more useful guide than a calendar statement, for example.

---

*The Outline of the report appears at the end of this paper.

The Commission has looked at the question of the opportunities for research and graduate work in Canadian studies and this, of course, has enormous implications for our university libraries. One has to bear in mind that research is international, but nonetheless, I think it is reasonable to say that Canada has distinctive interests and problems, some of them pretty interesting, which do need research attention, but they are often not getting anything like the amount of attention that they need. In graduate studies, while more work is occurring each year, there has been an enormous amount of neglect of Canadian studies, for example, one of our major universities which has a very extensive program of English literature at the graduate level (very nearly 100 options), has only one course related to the literature of our own country. It is only offered if people ask for it, and I think they are not terribly encouraged to ask for it. That kind of situation can be repeated in every part of this country with the possible exception of French-speaking Canada where there has been a much more healthy and natural tradition of academic interest in their own achievements.

Part of the trouble is indifference; part of it is that Canadian understatement; but part of it I think is downright discouragement and discrimination which is perpetrated primarily by Canadians on themselves. Our nationalists get up-tight about it and say it is the American professors who are doing it, but I think the chief culprits in the act are Canadian academics who are not very encouraging to young graduate students coming on who want to look at a problem relating to the Canadian north or the Canadian Maritime frontier or the problems of the Canadian native people, and who want them instead, almost as an article of academic faith, to pay attention to Hemingway, because that is who they paid attention to 20 years ago when they were at Cornell, or to pay attention to the problems of the race relations in the United States or in some other part of the world, because that is what they were looking at when they were in sociology 15 or 25 years ago. For the most part, it is unconscious, I think, but I am afraid there is a fair amount of conscious discouragement and discrimination directed also at young Canadian scholars who want to develop in respectable academic ways, their research interests at the graduate level in their own society.

Briefly, the Commission looked at the need for an understanding of our own academic traditions, which are distinct; they are not British, they are not French, they are not American or German; they are an extraordinary thing - the product of our own history. Unless we study them we cannot understand them and we cannot develop them in an appropriate way. And we, until recently, have done nothing about the study of our own educational institutions. We look at the Canadian component in education for the professions, again not in a chauvinistic way but in a common sense way. It is important that there be an appropriate awareness of the Canadian context in architecture, law, business, and engineering. Our country lost three miles of highway, and I mean literally lost, nobody quite knows where it went, about two seasons ago because it was built with the best and most approved and respected California standards, and it was built on permafrost. It just had no relevance to the climatic conditions of this country. This is true, of course, of a great deal of the architecture which our students are taught and which they regurgitate from ranch bungalow conceptions of living that really do not have much place in our society, given the tremendously different climate and, to some extent, the different lifestyle. So there is a need for a kind of thoughtful review of our professional education arrangements, just to see that we are not short-changing the students, that we are preparing them to live and to serve the society that they will actually be in.

Science, like research of course, is and must be international, but there are in fact areas of scientific need pertaining particularly to the problems of this country or to the opportunities provided by the land mass of this country, that we could profitably devote far more attention to than we are.

I think the most important development in higher education in Canada in the last 20 years has been the tremendous growth of the community college system. In significance this probably surpasses the development at the university level. Fifteen years ago there were three or four community colleges in Canada; today there are almost 200, so this has been a revolutionary development, and it is important that we look at what is happening in that area of postsecondary education.

We are looking at the kind of educational opportunities to learn about this country which students are receiving in the schools before they come to the universities. This is simply an acknowledgement of the fact that education is, of course, a continuum.

Regarding Canadian studies abroad, there is a large and growing interest in many other parts of the world about this country. So far we have failed to respond to this interest. One of the jobs of the Commission is to identify this interest and to make recommendations about ways of supporting teaching and research about Canada. There has been a phenomenal growth of interest in Canadian studies in the U. S. There are at the moment approximately 600 professorial specialists throughout the universities of the United States in the field of Canadian studies. They receive little or no assistance or support or encouragement from Canadian universities or from any of the public agencies of Canada. And, sometimes, when they do, it does not really fit their needs very well.

Human resources is where the Commission has to look at the questions of background, citizenship and qualifications of faculty, and try to sort some reason out of some desperately sensitive situations. In brief the salient points are these: approximately one-third of the full-time teaching staff at Canadian universities are not Canadian. One may feel that it is a very healthy thing to have a good mix of people in the professoriate; I do. The problem that many people see is that it is not a mix; it is overwhelmingly from one country. And no matter how attractive and desirable the people may be from the one country, the value of a mix is lost if you are receiving so many of your foreign professors from just one nation. This also occurs at the level of graduate students. Fifty percent of the doctoral students at Canadian universities are not Canadian; in the United States, the figure is six. Fifteen percent of the teaching staff of Canadian universities are Americans; in the United States, one percent of the teaching staff are Canadians. In the United States, the proportion of non-Americans of your university faculties to those of you from the neighboring country is well under ten; in Canada, it varies between 30 and 40 percent. It is a very special situation: there is no other country in the world which has more than 10 percent of its teaching faculty from outside that country; we have about 35 percent. There is no other country in the world which has more than 10 percent of its doctoral students from outside that country, and we have about 50 percent. These are things we have to sort out in the most constructive way possible.

The report then looks at support areas, in particular, libraries and archives. We have had great assistance from the Canadian university library community in assessing how strong the library collection policies are in support of Canadian studies, and I hope we can make some helpful recommendations there. We also look at archives, galleries, museums, and other national agencies of cultural support for higher education.

This is just a very brief report to you on what the Commission on Canadian Studies is doing and what are some of the problems that we are dealing with in this way in this country.

* * * *

(The Outline of the Commission's Report appears on the following page.)

Proposed Chapter Outline of

The Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies

1) Preface
2) Introduction
3) The Rationale for Canadian Studies
4) Canadian Content in the University Curriculum
5) Opportunities for Research and Graduate Work in Canadian Studies
6) The Study and Administration of Canadian Universities
7) The Canadian Component in Education for the Professions
8) Native Studies
9) The Sciences and Canadian Studies
10) The Community Colleges and Canadian Studies
11) The Schools and Canadian Studies
12) Canadian Studies Abroad
13) Scholarly Communications and the Canadian Academic Community
14) Human Resources: Requirements for Qualified Personnel to Meet the Needs of the Canadian Academic Community.
15) Libraries and Canadian Studies
16) Archives
17) Museums, Art Galleries, Fine Arts, Artifacts, the Performing Arts
18) Audio-Visual Resources and Media Support for Canadian Studies
19) Publishing and Publication
20) The Private Donor and Canadian Studies: Foundations; Corporations; Individuals.

FINANCING INTERLIBRARY LOAN SERVICES

MR. HOPP: Perhaps one could, without too much challenge, dub 1974 as the Year of the Interlibrary Loan. My perception of interlibrary loan activities may be prejudiced by the multitude of first drafts, preliminary drafts, revised drafts and final reports of the various studies which I have read during the past year. Today we are seeing the culmination of at least one aspect of interlibrary loan, that which relates to fees. This morning we are going to be hearing material for information (and I want to emphasize that: for information). Then this afternoon we are going to be considering some of the same material for a decision. I trust all of you will have read the report Methods of Financing Interlibrary Loan Services, which was prepared by the Westat Corporation under a contract from the Association of Research Libraries. I think this was distributed to all of you earlier this year.

Among the many appointments that I have made since I assumed the presidency, none has been more critical, in my judgement, than the chairman of the new standing Committee on Interlibrary Loans. I was fortunate to be able to persuade David Weber, Director of Stanford University Libraries, to take the chairmanship of this important committee, and he has an excellent roster of committee members. He and his committee will be presenting the program this morning for the first half of the session; Mr. Weber will moderate the session.

* * * *

MR. WEBER: Good morning, and welcome again to a topic that has been with us for quite a number of years. What with tighter book budgets, sharp increases in book prices, broader scholarly interest on the part of our faculty and scarcity of many an out-of-print item, the usefulness of interlibrary loan is apparent; its growth in the years ahead has been forecast as essential to the continued effective support of libraries and to all parts of our society. It is a major service, as libraries try to cope with the problems of the 1970's -- what President Corson of Cornell has termed "the dynamics of the potted plant" (in other words, "how to stay healthy when no growth is possible"). This is, in fact, what most if not all of our institutions are heading towards. There is evidence that there will be declining total collegiate enrollment over the next 15 years due to a decline in the birthrate, some shift of interest away from academic programs and a saturation of the collegiate market, since the percentage of high school graduates who elect to pursue the next degree will have reached its practical maximum.

This leads to difficult financial times for both public and privately-supported institutions, and the phrases "orderly retrenchment" and "stable state" now appear in discussion of long-range planning. Where there is no growth, there is sharply limited room for innovation and flexibility, a situation which affects libraries at least as severely as other parts of the college or university. When the cost of buying books is going up at twice the rate of the cost of living, where computer usage and microphotography make minimal in-roads in the control of escalating library costs, and where government policy is currently crimping program support for libraries of all types (except, perhaps, in medical schools), where can we turn in our effort to improve the effectiveness and rapidity of accessing information with financial support that does not provide adequate normal budget improvement?

Because it presents an interesting parallel to our current concerns, I interject reference to a paper for the American Council on Education that was prepared by Howard R. Bowen, Chancellor, Claremont Colleges. Dr. Bowen was asked to review "The Financing of Higher Education: The Current State of the Debate." His was an analysis and comment on the six recent reports of the Carnegie Corporation, the National Board on Graduate Education and the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, among others. Dr. Bowen starts by referring to "accepted pre-war dogma, scarcely debated, that tuitions should be low to encourage attendance of young men and women of all social classes. Tuition and fees in state universities average about $100 a year or a little more." He continues, "In the early 1970's, more radical lines of thought were emerging. There was the proposal that support of state colleges and universities should come relatively more from the tuition and relatively less from taxes." The high tuition idea was adopted by some on the pragmatic ground that additional funds were needed and that tuitions were the only practical source. But the idea of high tuitions was advocated by others on principle; some argued that both equity and efficiency would be promoted if the higher education industry were operated without public subsidy along the lines of the free market, with tuitions covering the full cost of instruction. And again I quote: "The aim of other economists was to capture some of the subsidies being received by high income families and use them to support low income students and to augment institutional budgets." And later, Dr. Bowen asks, "Who should pay the costs? The general citizenry through taxes? The most affluent who can afford full costs? The low income family with high intellectual potential? etc."

Fortunately the question of interlibrary loan costs and the equitable financing of these expenses seems a far simpler issue. Last January the ARL heard a report from Rutherford Rogers on the position taken by three advisory committees with respect to the recommendations of the Westat report on the financing of interlibrary loans. The ARL Board of Directors, in January, 1974 decided to establish a standing Committee on Interlibrary Loans with the charge to resolve the recommendations on fees for interlibrary loans as recommended by Westat, and the System of Interlibrary Communication (SILC), a TWX-queried, computer-based interlibrary communications system recommended by Becker & Hayes. The charge does not read explicitly that these are to be implemented, but there is the presumption that sufficient merit exists in the fee-coupon system for financing loans and the SILC computer-based system of communication that the ARL membership may indeed find one or both of them of advantage to our institutions.

The specific questions of fees and the method of payment are the ones that will today be put before the membership. But a comment on SILC: the fee question is not dependent on SILC. SILC is merely a communication and accounting system. It would not be ready for full service for at least three or four years. If fees are adopted, SILC could easily handle fee accounting when the computer system is ready. Thus, coupons or other methods of payment are merely the initial vehicle, with SILC a future option.

The Interlibrary Loan Committee presents this morning's program with the specific intent of reviewing the background of the fee and coupon issue, and presenting some data to help with your decision this afternoon. We will begin with Mr. Heron's paper on the interlibrary loan traffic and the two Westat studies.

* * * *

Background on ARL Studies

MR. HERON: Members of the Association of Research Libraries have been increasingly aware in the past decade of the rapid growth of interlibrary borrowing and of the predictable concentration of demand upon the larger libraries because they are the most likely to have what the borrowers need.

There are several apparent reasons for this growth:

1. The exponential rate of discovery and publication, which has been called the Information Explosion.

2. The rapid evolution of new colleges and universities, particularly since Sputnik appeared in the October sky in 1957, and the fashionable metamorphosis from college to university which has continued even into the apocalypse of the Carnegie Commission.

3. The growth within these institutions of new academic programs -- particularly at graduate levels -- without due consideration for the size of their libraries.

4. The role of government, of industry, and of private foundations in their generous support of applied research in universities, in industrial corporations, and in a variety of R&D complexes which have pursued and promoted organized research, much of it related to defense, outer space, and the health sciences. Some of this support has gone into

> libraries, but it has been so distributed as to enhance, rather than diminish dependence upon major institutions.
>
> 5. State and regional networks devised and publicly supported to make information available to anyone who needs it, regardless of geographic, economic, and hierarchic obstacles.

We know from the Westat studies and their antecedents that these and other developments in education, industry, and government have doubled the number of interlibrary loans during the years 1965-1970, and we face the probability that the number will increase by 50 percent in the next five years. This increase in volume would be a significant problem even if the interlibrary loan process conformed to the simplistic notion of balanced reciprocity -- if all libraries shared alike the cost and benefit of the flow of information and materials. We also know from these studies that relatively few of the academic libraries involved enjoy this kind of balance, and this has probably been true for a long time. James Westfall Thompson, in The Medieval Library, writes:

> As early as 936 Pope Leo VII had declared that Fleury was the chief of all monasteries. Its library was so rich from the beginning of the tenth century that whenever [the astronomer] Gerbert wished a rare volume he had only to send to Fleury... Fleury's manuscripts traveled the length of Gaul, and even went to England to be copied, sometimes overstaying the period of their loan.

It was the combination of imbalance and a volume which makes interlibrary loan a multimillion dollar system which has brought about the two studies which we are considering today, the first Westat cost study published in 1972, which measured and described the problem, and the second, the report which you have recently received, Methods of Financing Interlibrary Loan Services, which proposes some means of dealing with it.

Last January 17 at a session of the ARL Commission on Access Rutherford Rogers presented a summary of the Westat reports for discussion. His introduction deserves quotation:

> The magnitude of interlibrary loan requests handled by all types of libraries in the United States is estimated at more than ten million in 1972/1973 and nearly 18 million by 1979/1980; the proportion in research libraries is about 2.2 million in 1972/73 and 3.6 million in 1979/80. The largest libraries lend much more than they borrow. Lending outside the state by the large academic library is more common than out-of-state lending by other libraries. Most frequently

borrowed items are in English and those published in the last ten years. Books predominate in public library borrowing; academic libraries borrow other forms of material about as frequently as books; special libraries borrow predominantly serials. The majority of requests are completed within local or intrastate regional systems, a large number of other requests are filled within the state, many of those remaining are filled within the multi-state region, so that only a fraction of all requests go outside the region. Approximately 70% of requests are filled; 15% cannot be filled because the library receiving the request did not own the item, 10% because the item was lost, missing, or at the bindery, in use, on reserve, or otherwise temporarily not available, and 5% because the item could not circulate.

Some major problems of the present system are:

1. the unequal distribution of lending and corresponding inequities in cost, with a few of the largest libraries handling a large proportion of the requests;

2. the difficulty of filling requests which are incomplete, incorrect, or inadequately checked [30 percent of all citations are incorrect].

3. lack of access to bibliographic and/or location services [as noted above, 15 percent of all requests are for material not in the libraries asked for it];

4. slow communication and delivery services;

5. lack of reliable statistics.

The Westat studies, and the closely related study done by Rolland Stevens for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science were advised by ARL committees, and the Westat advisory committee was, in my opinion, broadly representative of the several points of view within the Association.

The point of view of the large private university, whose problem is perhaps epitomized in the 1970 Harvard study which estimated an annual interlibrary lending cost of half a million dollars, is predictably the most apprehensive, and (perhaps hyperbolically) recalls Polonius's advice to his son Laertes:

> Neither a borrower nor a lender be
> For loan oft loses both itself and friend,
> And borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry.

One of the Westat discoveries was that 82 percent of the largest lenders (whose lending to borrowing ratio was 7:1 or higher) felt that interlibrary lending was a serious burden.

The opposite point of view, generally recognized by the committee, is perhaps best represented in the resolution of the Interlibrary Loan Committee of the American Library Association at the midwinter 1973 meeting:

> Whereas interlibrary loan is an extremely valuable service to library users which has contributed to the advancement of knowledge in all fields;
>
> Whereas some libraries now levy interlibrary lending fees because of the increased costs of interlibrary loan;
>
> Whereas these fees can result in undue hardship for library users and seriously impair the free flow of knowledge;
>
> Therefore be it Resolved that:
>
> (1) No library should make a decision to levy an interlibrary lending fee without first consulting borrowing libraries in their state and national network,
>
> (2) Interlibrary lending costs for all types of libraries should be thoroughly studied by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science or some appropriate agency, and
>
> (3) Any recommendation for financing interlibrary loan including lending fees should be thoroughly discussed by the library profession before implementation.

The study team and its advisory committee have considered long and carefully the conflicting responsibilities which ARL libraries have to their immediate constituencies and those to the broader communities of which they are a part.

The three crucial recommendations which emerge are:

1. Acceptance by the Association of a standard fee which borrowers should be prepared to pay for interlibrary loans, establishing a simple mechanism for its payment, and understanding that lending institutions might waive the fee.

2. Recommendation of public subsidy of interlibrary loan costs "as a second stage to support or supplant a fee system..."

3. Establishing the fee at less than the cost per lending transaction calculated in the Westat studies, and using coupons as a medium of exchange.

Inevitably the committee felt (and I think that I may presume to say the same for the study team) that there may have been other options and undiscovered problems with those which were considered. The Association has unusual responsibilities to the whole library community simply because its corporate membership has great influence in that community.

Although the choices are difficult the Association's responsibility has traditionally been the early recognition of significant library problems and assumption of a role of leadership in meeting them.

In the context of this wider responsibility, it is appropriate to end with a quotation from the February Westat report:

> With the present system, many believe it is only a matter of time until most large lending libraries will be forced to charge for loans. Once several large libraries impose charges, the following shift to noncharging libraries will force these to start charging also. The institution of charges will result in a chain reaction throughout the library community.

If this hypothesis is accepted (and there is certainly some evidence to support it), ARL's most important responsibility in this querulous year may be to find means to control that chain reaction.

* * * *

Implications for Action

MR. WEBER: In order to help with your decision, it may be of use for me to outline what could be the various developments if the ARL decided to proceed. Since there could be a variety of alternatives to partial plans and certain institutions that, for their own reasons, adopt the unique programs, this scenario will deal only with what might be ahead if the Westat recommendations are adopted as the master plan. The following then might result:

1) Report the ARL decision and recommendations to other library associations and publicly to the American Library Association at the interlibrary loan program meeting this July in New York;

2) Clarification of the fee-coupon procedure and conformity with federal and state regulations, and clarification of relational aspects vis-a-vis other library associations, state libraries and national libraries;

3) Formation by ARL of a representative management committee or fee management committee with the function to formulate policies on setting of fees, monitor use of the fee structure, determine effects of the use of fees, oversee the operating manager or clearinghouse, and monitor the usefulness of the system. The Committee would serve as a Board of Directors, in effect. The composition of the Committee would be broadened in later years to include non-ARL libraries using the fee system so as to maintain user-representation.

4) In order to lay the basis for sound planning of the amount of coupons needed, the representative management committee would sample perhaps 200 libraries with major interlibrary loan volume in order to estimate coupon requirements for those that are not recompensed in some other way or where there would be a determination not to use coupons.

5) Exploration of coupon management with four or five organizations which might manage the printing of coupons, sales of coupons, managing of investments, accounting, monitoring of the amount of use and evaluating the results. This is certain to require all of next Fall before the committee could recommend a manager to the ARL Board. It could then take the early months of 1975 to work out the basis for contractual relationships with such a clearinghouse.

6) Simultaneous with the above, there would be exploration of the source of initial funding, since seed money will be required to finance the staff for the management and to print and distribute coupons as requested by libraries.

7) Review of the Westat basis of $3.50 per coupon in order that it could be verified for 1975-76 or modified to reflect estimates of 1975 costs, and a final decision on the initial fee by the management committee with review and authorization by the ARL Board of Directors.

8) Inclusion of interlibrary loan statistics in Academic Library Statistics, beginning with the 1973-74 issue.

9) Development and distribution to all potential users late next Spring of a procedure information leaflet.

10) Compilation of a list of libraries in state systems, consortia or other arrangements, where there is a substitute for the fee reimbursement, such a list to be published in order that coupons not be handled needlessly. Such a listing might, of course, be handled within each consortium with each group sending its list to a central point if, and as, deemed useful.

11) Start implementing the plan, possibly as early as July, 1975. It might commence on a voluntary basis so that all larger libraries, perhaps over 500,000 volumes, would follow this system for traffic among themselves; while those which are below that collection size would pay the fee if they were in a position to do so, or chose to do so. The intent here would be to give adequate information and advance notice for budgeting purposes for small libraries with relatively small staff and presumably less budget flexibility. The full implementation for all libraries would follow, perhaps in a few months, perhaps as early as January, 1976. It might initially apply to the United States and Canada, but not to loans made to libraries of other countries. TWX inquires could be covered by indicating the coupon serial number and sending coupons in advance or following receipt of books loaned.

12) Photocopy requests from libraries might be added in September, 1976, and also, coupons could be used to cover payment for library publications or other interlibrary expenses.

13) Late in 1976, coupons could become affectionately known as 'ill sams' after an admired admiral of our choppy seas.

14) Early in 1977 development by the ARL Interlibrary Loan Committee of a funding model to serve as a state, local and federal partnership promotion plan, or preparation of the model by the fee manager with review by the management committee and the Interlibrary Loan Committee might occur. The plan would constitute a recommendation for cost reimbursement by states for service among libraries, by the federal government for the interstate traffic, and with special subject networks considered for a third source of reimbursement. ARL would join with other groups to advocate recognition of this need and urge its funding.

15) SILC, the computer-based interlibrary communication system, could be fully implemented by 1978/79, and in its second year could replace coupons with its accounting module.

16) Finally, a federal-state resource funding program comes to life replacing the fees for loans. I am afraid I can not judge the timing of this.

Before we turn to a summary of arguments for and against the recommendations of the Westat study, I shall report communications I have received in recent weeks from several of the 16 library associations which were invited by Stephen McCarthy to make preliminary comment as input to our deliberations today. From the ARL office, a letter went out March 19, 1974 to each of these associations, summarizing briefly the background to our present consideration, the proposals of the Westat study on fees for interlibrary loans, and the specific recommendations that Westat and the advisory committee supported.

A response came from the past-Chairman of the Independent Research Libraries Association. He supports the proposition of fees and the use of coupons. One problem was foreseen with respect to coupons used for payment of photocopy charges, in that a large number of requests come from individuals and from publishing houses.

A response came from Charles Stevens, the Executive Director of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, indicating he could see the necessity for the cost reimbursement scheme to be instituted. He cited two objections to the plan, and I quote:

> One is that the charge, however small, will keep some good, poor scholars from gaining access to needed items. This is really a loss. The other is that copyright holders will have a larger case than before that they should reap some of the cash-flow that goes from borrower to lender. With fees set at cost recovery levels after a few years, the argument will be that the lender is making an unjust profit at the expense of the copyright owner. This argument could, if lost by the libraries, cost more than the whole income to be derived from the loaning or copying of books.

The ALA Reference and Adult Services Division said it was impossible to provide an official statement but its Interlibrary Loan Committee would submit its views. This was done in a letter from Virginia Boucher, the committee chairman which reads as follows:

The ILL Committee, RASD, ALA, is vitally interested in the management of interlibrary loan in the United States. The following statement was adoped by the ALA Reference and Adult Services Board in January 1973:

> Whereas interlibrary loan is an extremely valuable service to library users which has contributed to the advancement of knowledge in all fields;
>
> Whereas these fees can result in undue hardship for library users and seriously impair the free flow of knowledge;
>
> Therefore be it resolved that:
>
> 1) No library should make a decision to levy an interlibrary lending fee without first consulting borrowing libraries in their state and national network,
>
> 2) Interlibrary lending costs for all types of libraries should be thoroughly studied by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science or some appropriate agency, and
>
> 3) Any recommendation for financing interlibrary loan including lending fees should be thoroughly discussed by the library profession before implementation.

The Interlibrary Loan Committee, RASD, ALA, agrees that some libraries are having grave difficulties in meeting the expenses of interlibrary loans. We agree that those libraries with exceedingly disparate lending/borrowing ratios or those in dire financial straits might be forced to institute a fee in order to cut down on the number of lending requests or to recoup some financial loss. We see some difficulties, however, with the proposed ARL fee structure for interlibrary loans:

1. The restriction on the flow of knowledge resulting from a fee structure is greatly underestimated in the report. Inability to pay because of inadequate and rigid budgeting practices and clientele without enough financial resources is a fact of life for most libraries.
2. Cooperative sharing of resources among libraries would be hampered because of the fiscal barrier set up by a fee structure.

3. There is no guarantee that money received for ILL activities in a library would go into the financing of ILL activities in that library.

4. There is no guarantee that shorter turnaround transaction time and better service would result from a borrowing fee structure.

5. There is no incentive to make ILL activities more efficient - the report merely suggests a method to subsidize present activities.

6. There is no provision for a major educational effort for the reasonable use of ILL. Interlibrary loan employees and library users alike are often unaware of proper interlibrary loan procedure.

7. There seems to be no effort to tie this action in with national network planning.

8. Charging borrowing fees may prejudice the library position in regards to pending copyright legislation.

The Interlibrary Loan Committee, RASD, ALA, would like to recommend the following:

1. That ARL libraries, as a group, should not adopt a unilateral fee structure until the possibility of adequate funding for ILL from national and state sources has been exhausted.

2. That the ARL Interlibrary Loan Committee develop standard and useful guidelines for keeping interlibrary loan statistics which could be collected from all ARL libraries in order to arrive at a more accurate picture of interlibrary loan activities.

3. That a mechanism be developed whereby interlibrary loan requests must clear a state (be declared not available within that state), and/or abide by the provisions of the National Interlibrary Loan Code, 1968, in regards to verification and location before being accepted by an ARL library from an out-of-state requestor.

4. That management of interlibrary loan, such as staffing, training and work flow, be studied and recommendations made with a view to more efficient interlibrary loan operation.

We would urge that you consider our comments carefully.

Sincerely,

Virginia Boucher, Chairman
ILL Committee, RASD, ALA

* * * *

The Argument: Pro

MR. WEBER: We now turn to the arguments on the fee issue. It may help the afternoon debate for your committee to present briefly the pro and con without extended polemics. The two committee members making these presentations are not speaking for their institutions; they are merely trying to summarize the arguments to aid our discussion. So without further ado, the first speaker speaking in favor of the proposed system is John Humphry.

MR. HUMPHRY: New York State is known for its library networks and for its commitment to their fiscal support. The network under discussion here this morning is wholly subsidized by the State of New York and is known as the New York State Interlibrary Loan System, or NYSILL, for short. It is also that network that brings together, through an interface, all of the networks that are operated under a subsidy by New York State. The long-term commitment to fiscal support of the libraries in New York State may render it unfair for me to speak on behalf or in favor of a fee system. Nonetheless, I do predict that the establishment of a fee system will lead us, or accelerate the decision, to seek state and federal subsidies in support of this program.

Let me describe briefly the New York State Interlibrary Loan System to give you a picture of the operation, and demonstrate the fact that it is indeed a possibility to work under such a fee structure and a subsidy.

Our interlibrary loan network is the major and wholly subsidized statewide component of the Reference and Research Library Resources System. This program which is built on the base of the public library system program in New York State, is popularly known as the 3R's; it has been in existence since 1967 and it is a two-level program, state and regional, set up to meet the academic and research needs generated by the post-World War II era. There are nine regional systems and their memberships comprise academic, public, business, industrial and cultural institution libraries.

The public library systems, however, continue to meet the general library needs of users in New York State, and the 3R's systems bring service to the academic and research communities. Our philosophy is, under the 3R's system, that it provides access to research level materials by the serious library user over 18 years of age, regardless of his location in the state.

The New York State Library, a library oriented to academics, is the focal point of the network; it serves as the hub and the switching center for the other 12 libraries which make up the network. These 12 libraries are under contract with the state of New York, costing us approximately $500,000 a year to operate. The libraries in the referral network include nine private research libraries which have designated subject responsibilities in which they make loans; and there are three major public libraries which provide backstopping resources for more general materials. All 12 of these libraries receive a participation grant, they receive a fee for search, and if they fill the request, they are further reimbursed.

The second point that I want to make is that this system is hierarchical in nature. It is not meant to meet the needs of all comers. The process in New York State is that there is a local and regional clearance before these requests come to the state and are referred to 12 contracting libraries. There is, therefore, a planned pattern of referral, and we make every attempt to utilize these local and regional resources.

This system has been in operation for 25 years and the public library system headquarters serve as the bibliographic clearing house for the public library requests. The Reference and Research Systems, with the headquarters usually in an academic library, clear the requests for the academic and research requesters. There is an interface between these two types of centers and cross-lending of materials is a prime factor.

In addition to the clearinghouse function, the 3R's bibliographic centers provide bibliographic verification services and reference service to all types of libraries in a region. This method of local clearance, fully utilizing area resources regardless of whether they are academic, public or special, serves the greater portion of interlibrary loan traffic in the state.

Last year, the interlibrary loan traffic in NYSILL was 170,000 requests out of 1,5000,000 requests for interlibrary loans generated within the state. It is therefore apparent that the largest percentage of interlibrary loans is satisfied locally, and only those requests for advanced materials are forwarded to the State Library, which meets 45 percent of these requests before they are referred to the contracting libraries.

In 1973 a pilot interface was initiated between the interlibrary loan network and the Regional Medical Library Program (RMLP) built on the National Library of Medicine's nationwide regional program. This interface builds on the NYSILL hierarchical structure and provides for the referral of medical requests into the regional medical network if they are unfilled at the State Medical Library and the New York Academy of Medicine. The New York Academy of Medicine Library is our contract library for medicine and it is also the headquarters for Region 2 of RMLP. This library, therefore, can convert from one network to another when requests dictate.

We do have certain eligibility factors for entry into the NYSILL System; we do not include requests for fiction, textbooks, current publications, reference materials, popular materials, genealogy, children's books. These materials are met at local levels.

The operation of the network demands good communication and the maintenance of precise records to ensure accurate and efficient service, and for our reimbursement program to the 12 contractual libraries. We' have therefore developed a data-phone link, teletype network, and we have undertaken the carefully measured development of a controlled computer system. There are 70 transmission sites strategically located throughout the state to serve the 1,000 libraries that are permitted entry into the system.

Most requests are received by teletype, but you can also mail the requests to us. Consistency is demanded; the library is either expected to send its requests by teletype or by mail. The computer lends itself to the maintenance of records and is used for this purpose. A serially actived, multiple-point message-switching capability is built in to handle referral of requests once a routing is assigned at the State Library. The hierarchical structure of the NYSILL network has already been described, but once a request is received at a transmission site, it is sent by teletype to the State Library, manually searched and various reports entered into the computer to indicate the action taken at the State Library. In the case where a request has not been filled and is eligible for referral, it is transmitted to the referral library in the state by teletype. This transmission is actually a function of the computer system. The referral library reports back to the computer from on-line programs and the computer makes a determination as to whether an additional referral is indicated. If it is, it is done by computer; if not, a final report is generated and transmitted to the requesting transmission site, which is responsible for referring the information back to the inquiring library.

The machine also generates lists of requests that are unfilled. At the present time we are conducting a study of unfilled requests: why they have not been filled, whether the material just is not in a New York State library. This helps us analyze the performance of the network and whether or not we are getting maximum performance. We have had a number of problems that have surfaced, and you can guess them I am sure. The first is budgetary. We never have enough money to keep up with the requests. The system is increasing at approximately 20 percent per year; budgets do not increase at that rate. Therefore, the computer has saved us. Second, delivery time which started out to be very slow is now up to the place where we can fill a request or make a report within 48 hours. Another problem is bibliographic verification: many libraries just do not prepare a good bibliographic citation. This means that at the State Library, we have to do a great deal of bibliographic searching.

Let me summarize some of the points I would like to make in favor of this kind of fee or subsidized program; we feel it should be hierarchical, that there should be these patterns of referral if the program is going to work. There should be eligibility factors; the user and his serious approach should be considered. Certain materials should be excluded. It should be computer-assisted. There should be continuous training and orientation of personnel at all levels. There should be careful monitoring and evaluation of system. The long-term solution should lie in a state and federal subsidy in line with the commitment of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

We have found that budget officers continuously ask us why we do not charge fees. Why do we not ask the libraries to pay for services rendered? We have resisted, and I think we are over the worst of this because the New York State Interlibrary Loan program has just received a $100,000 increase in its budget. I think it is a recognition of the fact that the state sees the value of shared resources. It shows, too, in a dramatic way, the imbalance. And it is a case in favor of a fee structure. Appropriating bodies need to be shown dramatically that external services cost money, and therefore, are entitled to reimbursement.

Our system is operational; we are not talking about proposing a system -- it is working! The accounting is not difficult. The computer handles all of it for us; it tells us at any given time how much a library is owed and when it is being paid; what its performance is; how it can do better. The whole system lends itself to the application of the computer and the computer's capability. So I have every expectation that the fee structure will accelerate the establishment, by government, of subsidies for this program. And, finally, that this access will turn out to be a right and not a privilege.

* * * *

The Argument: Con

MR. CHAPIN: When speaking to this group on the subject of "free" interlibrary loan, one gets a feeling of futility: as if the decision has already been made. The following statements, not taken at random, indicate the difficulty of this assignment.

(1) At the 80th ARL meeting, Arthur McAnally, speaking for the Interlibrary Loan Committee on the magnitude of the problem said: "This would leave them (the 63 largest academic libraries) carrying about ... two-thirds of the cost, or almost $200,000 each." (Minutes of the 80th ARL meeting, p. 14)

(2) The report before us at this meeting is not for the fee as such, but rather for the equitable distribution of costs: "The primary improvement would be an economically viable system that would recognize the need to distribute costs in a more equitable manner among participants." (Westat. Methods of Financing Interlibrary Loan Services. 1974. p. 1)

(3) and, Stephen McCarthy's admonition that this is not a group decision, but rather an individual library decision: "...the report emphasizes that fees need not be universally applied and that no library would be obliged to require payment for interlibrary loans." (Letter to ARL membership dated March 15, 1974).

We have been told, in effect, that the ARL academic libraries are spending, on the average, $200,000 to provide interlibrary loan services to others; that a fee system will give a better distribution to these costs; and that it is all voluntary. Being placed in a position to oppose this logic is difficult, but, hopefully, not impossible: even if the Board of ARL has already appointed a committee to implement the fee.

First, let us take another look at "$200,000 each" that the 63 largest academic libraries are spending to subsidize interlibrary lending. I will not consider the cost figures, ranging from $6.81 to $2.05 for only 12 libraries (one might well wonder about an "average fee" that will make money for some libraries, and lose money for others), but the magnitude of interlibrary loan is suspect.

The 1972 Westat study, A Study of the Characteristics, Costs, and Magnitude of Interlibrary Loans in Academic Libraries, predicted 1,921,374 loans for 1972-73. Using McAnally's method of computation, the "63 largest academic libraries" would have lent 1,280,916 items.* In actual fact, the figures which most of you recently sent to me shows that the "63" actually lent some 748,000 items: 40 percent less than predicted. So, we are dealing with 748,000 not 1,280,000.

---

*See attached Worksheet.

Therefore, we only have three-fifths of a problem. But there is more. Let us assume that the private institutions have a unique problem, but let us also assume that state institutions are going to have a difficult time charging in-state fees. Over 70 percent of the loans are from state-supported institutions. The first Westat study indicated that 64 percent of all loans are in-state. The state institutions' in-state traffic therefore, would account for some 342,000 loans, or another one-fourth of the Westat prediction.

It is difficult to identify all of the deducts: consortia loans (such as, Illinois, Wisconsin and New York) and loans of depository materials (such as U.S. publications, Atomic Energy Commission documents, and others), but two are available: 152,000 regional medical library loans and the 223,000 items that we borrow for our own use, presumably from each other.

The magnitude of the problem then is not $200,000 each", but 748,000 - 342,000 - 152,000 - 223,000 ÷ 63 x $3.50, or an average of $1,719 per library. (Let it be noted, that except for the difference of some 533,000 in the magnitude of the problem, the Interlibrary Loan Committee was concerned only with total cost--to somebody--and not the deductions noted above. But even then, the actual loans of 748,000 ÷ 63 x $7.00 cost would be $83,000 each, not $200,000. But the McAnally Committee did include costs for unfilled requests: a charge which according to the present report should not be assessed because "the service requested is ... document delivery and if this service is not provided, no charge should be made." (p. 42).

Now we turn to the second statement: distributing costs in an equitable manner. Few would disagree with this concept, but the proposed solution might well increase the total load, and the report even encourages an entrepreneurship to corner the market in fewer libraries. Page 59 of the report before us says, "... libraries choosing to charge ... may find it possible to reduce or eliminate previous restrictions on the class of user or scope of material loaned." And on page 5: "An improved interlibrary loan system should benefit public, school, and special libraries as well as academic libraries." If the philosophy behind our proposed action is to unburden the research libraries, are we prepared to throw away the present restrictions of the interlibrary loan code that limits loans to materials that "cannot (be) readily obtain(ed) at moderate costs," and for the "research" use of the borrower?

The report establishes loans as a right, not a favor. When this is done, the initiative is in the hands of the borrower, not the lender. "It would diminish the concept of favor which is incorporated in the current system, increasing the borrowing library's right to obtain loans based on the charge paid." (p. 48).

Those of you who have worked at a reference desk will recall the postcard from an elementary student: "Please send me all of your books on biological science. They must be received in three days. Signed: Johnny." Can you imagine our response to this request if the fee proposal is adopted? "Dear Johnny: We have received your demand for materials of May 8th. Upon receipt of 125,000 coupons, the books will be sent by return mail. Sincerely, Interlibrary Loan Librarian."

More confusing, however, particularly for a proposal aimed at more equitable distribution of loans, is the concept of entrepreneurship. Page 73: "... the service requested is not bibliographic verification but document delivery and if this service is not provided, no charge should be made." As you consider these statements, bear in mind that the proposed $3.50 coupon is to recover one-half of the cost of the loan and nothing for unfilled requests. But the implication is that if you hustle and give better and faster service, then you will receive more requests and lend more items, all the while going deeper in debt for your interlibrary loan service.

Now we can turn to the concept that the fee system is voluntary. Mr. McCarthy's letter stated that "... the report emphasizes that fees need not be universally applied ... (etc.)" I cannot find where the emphasis is in the report, but I can find: "Once several large libraries impose charges, the following shift in requests to non-charging libraries will force these to start charging also. The institution of charges will result in a chain reaction throughout the library community." (pages 4-5). And on page 48: "It is anticipated that initially only a few libraries might charge, but that within time all would."

The report talks of changes "from a non-marketable to a marketable transaction" and about a "basic supply-and-demand balance." If interlibrary loans are to be equated with economics, then consider how the prime rate works and equate that with your individual decision to charge or not charge. Imagine a headline such as "East Lansing State Bank Increases Prime Rate, New York Banks Expected to Follow". That is as ridiculous as another headline: "M.S.U. to Charge for Interlibrary Loans, Eastern Schools Expected to Follow."

Not only will most libraries not have a choice on charging or not, they will not even have a say in the amount of the charge. The McCarthy letter says "... it is well known that there are many libraries that feel reimbursement for their interlibrary loan expense is an urgent matter: they are under pressure from their trustees, administrative officers and constituencies to use available funds to meet local library needs." Note that Mr. McCarthy talks about reimbursement for expense, not one-half of the expense as proposed. If one coupon is approved today, can two be far behind? And if only a few libraries increase the charge, we will all follow, for the report notes: "It is also necessary ... that charges be uniform over all libraries."

One can foresee the decision being made by only ten libraries, at a price determined by them. If a fee is instituted, coupons or not (and if I were a big net lender, I would give it serious consideration), then loans will be even less equitably distributed as the borrowers shop around. Non-chargers will be "discovered" and then they, too, will become big lenders and be eligible to join the cartel. Eventually, of course, we will return to today's distribution, with the only difference being a lesser burden because we have priced ourselves out of the market and we will have effectively destroyed the information exchange which works so well today: the interlibrary loan system.

* * * *

INTERLIBRARY LENDING: WORKSHEET

... The first Westat study estimated 2,691,000 requests for loans in 1972/73 and predicted a fill rate of 71.4%.

... 2,691,000 x .714 = 1,921,374 estimated loans for 1972/73.

... McAnally, speaking for ARL Interlibrary Loan Committee, as recorded in the Minutes of the 80th Meeting, Atlanta, May, 1972, estimated that two-thirds of the total would be from the 63 largest academic libraries.

... 1,921,374 x 2/3 = 1,280,916 estimated loans for 63 largest academic libraries.

... 63 of the 69 largest U.S. academic libraries reported in April, 1974, actual loans, including photocopies, of 747,937 for 1972/73.

... Westat/McAnally estimate was short 532,979 or 41.6%.

... State supported libraries among 63 reporting made 534,759 loans in 1972/73.

... Westat estimated 64% of all loans were in-state.

... 534,759 x .64 = 342,245 in-state loans by state financed libraries.

... 152,244 Regional Medical Library loans were made by the reporting libraries.

... Magnitude of interlibrary lending for 63 of the 69 largest U.S. academic libraries:

Total loans	747,937	
less	342,245	in-state (non-private)
less	152,224	Regional Medical Library
Balance	253,468	

... 62 of the 63 reporting libraries borrowed 222,528 items.

* * * *

Proposition for Vote

MR. LUCKER: This is the recommendation of the ARL Committee for Interlibrary Loans:

Given the facts that there are significant and identifiable costs which result from interlibrary lending, that many libraries are heavily net borrowers or are heavily net lenders, and given the fact that there are not to this date sufficient state or federal programs which reimburse libraries for sharing their materials with other publicly or privately supported libraries within or outside of the state, the ARL at its annual meeting in May 1974 recommends to ARL member libraries and to other libraries engaging in interlibrary loan that (subject to ascertaining their conformity with governmental regulations):

1) a fee is to be charged if the lender wishes for filled interlibrary loan requests;

2) a fee initially of $3.00 to nonprofit institutions;

3) a fee initially of $7.00 for loans other than for reprinting from a nonprofit institution to a commercial organization;

4) the fee to nonprofit institutions will within five years be increased to the full recovery figure, presently estimated to be $7.00;

5) the fee would not be initiated before July 1, 1975;

6) a coupon system will be used as the means of of handling the payments.

To execute these recommendations, an organization or institution will be selected to serve as the clearinghouse for payments; and, a committee will be created for guiding and administering the use of this method of financing interlibrary loan services but only so long as the system is judged to facilitate interlibrary lending and fairly apportion costs among users and only so long as the necessary federal or state programs for covering these costs are not adequate.

* * * *

MR. WEBER: The committee has tried this morning to summarize where we now stand and lay a basis for your decisions this afternoon. A copy of the text that Mr. Lucker has just read has been put on the table at the back of the room so that each of you may have a copy. This is the end of this morning's session. Thank you.

* * * *

ECONOMICS OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Matityahu Marcus
Rutgers University

MR. HOPP: In 1973, the American Council on Education published a book entitled Economics of Academic Libraries. One of our colleagues in reviewing the book said of it: "This is a landmark presentation and analysis of the salient statistics and data for 58 large university libraries from 1949 to 1969." Another reviewer noted: "This is a jargon-free recipe book for those who need to measure their university's library against others."

We have with us today one of the authors of this book, Professor Matityahu Marcus of Rutgers University. Mr. Marcus was co-author with William Baumol in the writing of the work. Professor Marcus is Chairman of the Department of Economics at Rutgers University, New Brunswick; he is also the Director of the Bureau of Economic Research. He is a graduate of Brooklyn College and holds a Ph.D degree from Brown University. He has had numerous honors and a long list of publications. He is going to give us the essence of the findings as reported in the book, and a general commentary on the future possibilities for the gathering of library statistics and their use for analyses.

* * * *

MR. MARCUS: Last week, when I picked up the Financial Section of the New York Times, I reconsidered whether I should appear at this forum because on the front page of that section, they had an article "Are Economists Worth Their Salt?" As I proceeded to read with great trepidation, the article pointed out that the various consensuses achieved by economists over the last year and a half have all proven wrong. Economists predicted a particular rate of inflation that turned out to be more than double what had been expected; they had forecast that interest rates would go down and you know what has happened to interest rates lately; and so on and so forth. And here they were talking about consensus of economists using very sophisticated models, econometric models, etc.

So, I just wondered whether somebody in the crowd here would not go and do some of these calculations in our book that we did for the Council on Library Resources, and come and confront me here. I hope nobody will be nasty enough to do that. But nonetheless, I think that the mandate that we assumed when we undertook the study was, in a way, broader than looking at specific cost relationships, trend lines and relationships between variables.

I think that the reason for this is fairly obvious, and I would like, with your permission to focus on these aspects rather than on some of the specific findings. First, it is most difficult to summarize a body of statistical findings. The findings themselves are not always consistent in the sense that they are derived by using difference models. They are statistical estimations. Moreover, by their nature, they are outdated; we worked with 1967-68 data. And furthermore, I think that if you are really interested in the specific findings, probably the best source and the most accurate one for that would be the book itself. I do, however, hope to illustrate some of my points with reference to findings.

The broader issues are, of course, more interesting, because I think you may wish to pose the question: "Can economists play a more constructive role in the design and planning implementation of library policy?" And perhaps one could start with the very first question: "What is an economic cost study, and how is it different from what you have been doing for many years?" Here are two economists, novices in the area of libraries, saying that they have made cost studies, and you know very well that you are dealing with these issues on a day-to-day basis. You are looking at costs; you are looking at your revenues. What is new about this? And what is the potential usefulness of an economic cost analysis? I think this is a legitimate question.

An economic cost analysis is concerned with identifying causal relationships in costs, rather than allocating costs in the manner that an accountant does. An accountant would look at your costs and would decide beforehand what is the proper way of allocating them to the various activities, whether it is interlibrary loan or cataloging or acquisitions and the like. And he will use some rules of thumb, very often arbitrary, to do this kind of allocation. He will view it as a cost study because the end product will be distribution of costs by activity, if you will. But the question is, are the results which he has come up with representative of causal relationships? Namely, in the case of interlibrary loan, do the figures that he has come up with represent the true, incremental costs that the library will have to incur as it extends a given number of volumes to other libraries?

As another illustration, take the issue of holdings; you have a stock of books which is quite separate from acquisitions and the additions and deletions. Does that stock of holdings, in and by itself, result in costs to the library? Where do these costs arise?

What do you do with some inputs, such as the Head Librarian, who is employed in various activities? After all, the Head Librarian, in one form or another, is responsible for acquisitions, cataloging, policy distribution and the like. How do you allocate his cost to the various activities to come up with a meaningful figure for the cost of interlibrary loan, or for the cost of reserve activities, or for the cost of the government documents department?

So what the economist attempts to do, by devising an appropriate statistical model, is to permit the isolation of cost effects of individual factors on particular activities. If we are successful in that, then we come up with estimates which will tell the library what are the incremental costs that are associated with expanding that activity.

Let me try now to illustrate this with an example from the findings. We found that the size of holdings, in and by themselves, affect the total cost of operations of the library; there is a quantitative, significant relationship. This is after we have accounted for the effect of staff and acquisitions. That suggests that even though we may not be quite sure how the size of the holdings in the library affects costs, (other than through staff and acquisitions) there is a statistical economic relationship there, and that relationship will emerge only if we are able to use what we call a multivariate model, a statistical relationship which utilizes several factors at the same time and estimates the influence of each one, separately as well as simultaneously. This is an example where probably the accountant will not be able to come up with an estimate of the effect of holdings because he has no rules by which to ascribe the costs of operations to holdings.

Now, there are several other illustrations, and it may be worthwhile to go into them in a little while. But I would like now, rather than continuing with this approach, to raise the fundamental issue: What do you do with these cost studies once you have them? Suppose you have a nice equation which tells you that staffing is related to holdings in a particular way, namely: it is not proportional to holdings but it increases at a decreasing rate; and we come up with that coefficient. What do you do with these economic cost studies that you have not done before? What is their use?

I think, in the past more than at present, the approach we used to take (if I understood from my very able colleagues at the advisory council and the committee) was a great deal of concern with proper budgeting. In other words, if we know, coming back to the earlier example, that for any 100,000 volumes added to your total collection, in one way or another operating costs rise by five or ten or fifteen thousands dollars, then this becomes a tool for budgeting and for planning. Your total budgetary request will no longer, therefore, be just for acquisitions, just for more staff, but all of a sudden we know that statistically, there are other facts which reflect themselves in that particular cost component which is related to size of total holdings. Fine and good.

And again, if we find that enrollment size affects total operating costs, again, quite independently of the staff, there is some additional relationship there; if the university is planning to add 1,000 or 2,000 students (I guess we do not do it anymore, but when we used to add students) this becomes an important input into your budgetary requests. But perhaps budget-making becomes less important or less useful if we are being faced with very rigid budgetary allowances. We are being told, in the new world, that the library is going to get a six percent increase in its allowance, or seven percent, or eight percent. If this becomes the case, then the usefulness of cost studies for budget-making, for preparing an elaborate rationale for why you should get 15 percent, may be academic, and may not even be a very useful deployment of your time.

At this point, I want to draw an analogy with the private sector. In the private sector, we all do cost studies, but the cost studies invariably are related to another aspect: namely, to pricing. A T & T has very sophisticated cost modeling in which they are now trying to estimate the cost of directory assistance and interexchange activity and repair and installation and the like. Previously they were not very concerned about it; they knew the total cost; they came up with tariffs which were going to very easily cover their revenue requirements; and there was no need to unbundle their services. There was no need to present detailed justifications for their tariffs; there was no need for them to know how much directory assistance actually cost. But when pressures started to mount in that particular case, the utility decided that it had to know where and why its costs were rising in such a manner as to require them to go to the regulatory commission and ask for a revenue increase.

I think there is an obvious analogy in that. The cost data and the cost analysis that the economist may provide you with tells you what is the cost of that activity in terms of the foregone opportunities of another activity in your library. In other words, suppose you conduct a very adequate economic cost study of the operations of your reserve section in the library. And you have also conducted, in the same study, the cost of circulation of government documents. The end result of this study will give you the rate of economic substitution between these activities. It will present you with the choices that you have to make given the previous assumption that your budget is going to grow by a fixed amount. You cannot have all desired levels of all activities. You will then know that, realistically speaking, if you are going to provide as much of a given level of government document service, the opportunity costs which you have to give up is a certain level of activity in the reserve room, in acquisitions, in journals, interlibrary loan and the like. In other words, do we really know what are the costs of each and every activity from the point of view of what we have to give up in an alternative activity to pursue that one by one more unit? This is what a well-founded cost study should provide you with.

Then, from that point, there are several other steps that could be taken. And I am saying this, again, with full understanding that I do not share your knowledge of the intricacies of library management. I am talking as an economist; I think probably this is the role you wanted me to take here, so I may be ignoring some important aspects in library management, but then again I could not speak constructively in that specific area.

The other usage of these rates of transformation, these rates of substitution between activities that the cost study will give you is really to say, either I am going to cut reserve room operations, for example because I believe that if one more unit of reserve room operations means sacrificing two units of government documents operations, this rate of sacrifice is not worth it in terms of my judgement of the product of the two activities. Or, alternatively, you may then be prepared to say which activity can we charge for and how much should we charge for it? It may very well be that although we feel that we are doing a very socially useful service when we charge our activities at zero price (and that is what the library is doing at the university), once you are a member of the university community the usage of any single activity in the library really implies zero cost, zero price. Yet from the library point of view, there is no zero cost; there is a cost involved in expanding these activities. So there is an issue of who is paying for it and how much are we going to give of a particular category? But there is no issue regarding the fact that each of these activities requires resources and, in the context that we have described, if you put more resources into one, you are going to put less resources into the other.

Now, I think that in some sense libraries are ideally situated to utilize or to build on this basis. You have a product, and I am talking as an economist now, and of course it is a multifaceted product: research assistance, bibliographic research, interlibrary loan and the like. Some aspects of that product can be easily metered and charged for. If you look at other aspects and other areas of university services, this is not the case. You cannot easily charge for classroom time based on the professor's salary (and that is about the only input that goes into the classroom time). Notice, by the way, that where we can do that, such as in laboratory fees or dining room facilities, we do it. We go more and more in that direction.

So, I am not here suggesting or recommending that we are going to move in the direction of basing all your services on the principle of pricing. What I am suggesting however, is that perhaps some parts of that multifaceted product could be priced, based on careful cost study. And if you are able to do that, you will be achieving what A T & T is trying to do: namely, you will be removing one section of your investment base (so to speak, the cost of service) to put it into the market. And if the demand is such and if the charges are such, it is entirely possible that this will become, at the least, adequate to cover the costs of that particular service.

One other illustration on costing and its relationship to pricing, because let me emphasize, good pricing has to be based on underlying costs; there is really no socially justified reason for setting a price which exceeds the true cost to the institution providing that service, unless you get into the business of deciding that you are going to tax some and subsidize others, which is a far more demanding activity.

But let us take one other area: do we know the cost to the library of additional research contracts carried out by our physical sciences in the university? Do you know? Do I know? Should we know? Yet, talking here about research institutions, we do quite a bit of contract work. We charge. We come with very specific numbers about the fringe benefits that should go to personnel, and I think at Rutgers it is now something like 63 percent on top of the out-of-pocket personnel costs. For the rest, we have an overhead allowance; that overhead allowance goes to the university and presumably, gets distributed in proportion to the library share of the university budget. Is that a reasonable way to distribute the overhead that comes from a research contract? Maybe this problem has been studied by some; but what I suggest here again is that unless we have a good cost study which will tell us the true incremental costs to the research library of doing 'x' millions of dollars of research work, we cannot then make the case either to the university administration of what is the proper support level nor can be charge the contracting agency properly. And I think either of these two avenues, at some point, may become very feasible and perhaps desirable routes for alleviating some of the economic pressures on the library.

* * * *

COMMENTS ON ECONOMICS OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Warren J. Haas
Columbia University

I hope a number of you will have questions for Mr. Marcus, so I will limit my comments to one brief assessment, two precautionary observations, one expression of frustration, and, finally, an evangelistic exhortation.

First, the brief assessment: as we have heard, Economics of Academic Libraries presents calculated data that (1) describes growth characteristics and cost trends in academic libraries during a 20 year period and (2) identifies the elements that seem most influential in determining library costs.

The calculated data is perceptively interpreted by the authors. The combination of technical expertise and careful analysis they demonstrate makes the study worthy of respect, and the explicit and implicit messages drawn from the analysis are of substantial importance to research librarians and to all who are concerned with academic library operations and performance.

The study is important for several reasons:

- First, it is a straightforward and uncluttered explanation of why research libraries are costly enterprises - in brief, it is the nature of the beast and not any distinctive ineptness of the keepers.

- Second, it provides a set of tables that give regression results for key variables affecting costs for private and public academic libraries in varying size categories. The information in these tables can be used to check, in at least general terms, budget validity and expenditure projections. But, the bleak news of these projections is so prominent that a third general message is forthcoming --

- Specifically, cost projections are of such a character that "in the long run, some fundamental changes in the mode of library operations may become inevitable."

This, briefly put, is the substance of the book. It has been carefully reviewed in The Chronicle of Higher Education and elsewhere with good results, and has underscored the financial problem for library and university administrators in a way that cannot be ignored.

Now let me turn to my two precautionary observations:

First, the time series study covered a period of unparalleled affluence, ending in 1969. It seems possible that the trend for the last five years might well reflect a reduced rate of increase in costs from the 10 percent compounded rate established in the study for the major categories of expenditures. The fact that the constant dollar rate of increase might be somewhat reduced does not solve any problems, however; it might simply delay the day of reckoning, for which we should be grateful because we need all the time we can get.

The second precautionary point centers on the assumption underlying some parts of the study that "big is better." This point is at the heart of the method devised to examine changes and trends in the university libraries represented in the data reported to ARL over a twenty-year period. In the words of the authors "we classified each of fifty-eight research libraries by growth of collection ... and size of holdings .... These classifications constitute crude attempts to produce broad categories of libraries differing significantly in qualitative characteristics."

This same correlation between numbers and quality is implicit in the section of the book that demonstrates how the established cost trends and characteristics can be used for budgeting purposes simply by extrapolating past experience into the future.

This too easy translation of large numbers into high quality bothered the advisory committee that was consulted by the authors, it bothers Fussler in his forthcoming review of the book for the Library Quarterly and it bothered the authors themselves, but there was little that could be done about it. The sad (or happy) fact is that there is not any acceptable way to measure the quality of academic libraries in ways susceptible to statistical analysis, and it is possible that there never will be. Therefore, the pressures are always strong to use available quantitative data as a surrogate for qualitative measures. To be sure, there is certainly a relationship between size and quality, but size is obviously not the whole story. It seems probable that the future will see even the limited validity of this relationship further diminished as academic and research librarians sharpen their understanding of new means to address the full range of library objectives and, in at least some cases, find ways to put information delivery capabilities on at least an equal footing with collection accumulating instincts.

Let me turn now to my expression of frustration. It concerns data about libraries. As you know, the letters "MIS" form the acronym for management information system. I will spare you my two-hour speech entitled "The Myth of MIS," but because some of our experts are not here I feel obliged to say something testy about statistics. There is no doubt that information susceptible to analysis and thus useful to management can be assembled, but there is some question that the process can be as systematic as some would have us believe. There are several parts to the management process, and each has its own information requirements and information products. The data typically reported by libraries and necessarily used by Baumol and Marcus is really only superficially descriptive of libraries (staff size and composition, collection size, serial titles currently acquired) and of their operations (volumes added, expenditures for a mixture of expense categories, i.e. people, collections, binding, and "other"). This reported information reflects operations with data captured in the process of accounting for expenditures and in recording processing activity. It is not the information required by those responsible for establishing objectives and priorities, it is not the information needed to formulate plans of action to accomplish those objectives, and it is not the information needed to measure results. In short, the information we assemble and report is a far from complete picture of what libraries are and do, and bears almost no demonstrable relationship to our objectives or performance.

The authors note, perhaps too politely, the shortcomings of the information that was used for analytical purposes and they make suggestions as to how even this most rudimentary library data can be standardized, moderately supplemented, and more efficiently used in the future. In at least partial response to these suggestions, ARL's Office of University Library Management Studies is at work on a project to sharpen definitions and reporting practices employed in ARL statistical compilations. But these problems are only the tip of the iceberg. We have yet to make an effective start on the task of linking library costs to library performance.

Now let me conclude with my evangelistic exhortation. This is a book about the high cost of running libraries, and the authors suggest that unless computers and communications technology and cooperative ventures of major proportions are employed to change library operations in fundamental ways, we will all go down in our sinking yachts -- and they are right.

But perhaps we should remember that in addition to taking our vows of poverty we have also assumed an obligation to perform a set of socially important objectives. It seems at least possible that we have viewed our obligations too narrowly. Perhaps academic research libraries, individually and in the aggregate, really have far more to do than we have assumed. Put more directly, unless our impact on teaching and scholarship in all subject areas is increased, we run the risk of always having our costs viewed as being too great. Fundamental change is needed, not only to reduce the cost of what we do, but to enable us to do even more with what are really very substantial resources.

* * * *

Discussion:

MR. MASON: I do not have a question, but I have a request. We undoubtedly will be doing the kind of sophisticated cost analysis that you are talking about repeatedly in the future. Where to find people who can do these is a real problem in librarianship. Now, why do not you take your nice young bright undergraduates and show them what a bright future they have in dedicating themselves to do this kind of thing in libraries, rather than getting into that dirty business thing where they get a lot of money and get thrown out of jobs every three years? It is really a wide open opportunity for young people in a field that is getting rapidly overcrowded; we do need people like this. They do not have to know about libraries; we can teach them, but we need their basic skills. And so you young ones should be giving them to us.

MR. MARCUS: How about sponsoring some assistantships or fellowships to the students in the graduate programs in economics who will do their Ph.D dissertations in areas of the economics of libraries? Then you get their commitment at that stage, you get a significant contribution, and you get a person who is then potentially qualified to continue on and move in that area.

We find that the U. S. Steel is doing that and A T & T is doing that and Union Carbide is doing that; this is the way to get people from another area to assist. I think probably from the point of view of economics that it might not be extremely costly. I think it is an excellent idea.

MR. WEBSTER: As Mr. Haas mentioned, one of the issues that we are currently concerned with in the Association is how we go about this process of improving our statistical reporting services. I am wondering if Professor Marcus would share with us some of his ideas on how that might be done, both in the sense that we are using the Academic Library Statistics as a descriptive tool, and also as we might aim down the road a little bit toward improving these statistics as measures of performance of academic libraries?

MR. MARCUS: I think that you are raising, of course, the million dollar question. Let me first just say some of the problems we have run into in the data that Mr. Haas alluded to. Mr. Dix alerted us that the definition of a professional librarian may not be the same among all institutions reporting to the Office of Education. It was a kind of elementary thing we wanted to do in terms of relating staff other than professional librarians and professional librarians separately to the library's activities. And we were not quite sure that universities do follow the same policy.

So, in part it is a matter of defining the measurements which you are going to employ, and then really accepting the discipline that goes with it, rather than saying, 'Well, that is what they want, but our institution is not going to do that.' The second part will have to do with questions such as "What do I want to measure? What are the kind of statistical data which are necessary for the purposes of my study?"

You cannot gather all data, all statistics. Any attempt at doing this is going to be wasteful and useless because it will turn out that you did not gather what you should have. So I again would suggest that rather than defining in the abstract what are the kind of ideal data that we need, you want to know beforehand, what use you are going to make of those statistics, and make sure that you gather them for that purpose, because, as I pointed out, you may be engulfed by them. It is here that the design of the study should be thought out, before you undertake the collection of data.

Another kind of problem we ran into which we did not report in the book, but I think may be worth noting: we wanted to get at some institutional characteristics that might explain some of the variations in costs, in acquisition policies, and we wanted to get at the issue of the graduate program, and the role of the graduate program relative to other activities of the school. Very quickly we found out, after tabulating some data and running some statistical tests and getting all kinds of nonsensical results, that graduate studies do not mean the same thing in all institutions. Some institutions are heavily into the part-time educational advanced degree program; they are essentially preparatory for M.A.'s and Ph.D's in education. But in terms of its impact on the library, it is quite different from what smaller schools, like Princeton, in terms of its graduate program, would do. So a simple statistic, such as the ratio of graduate students to nongraduate students did not work, and would not capture the kind of thing we wanted it to, which would be the interrelationship between the library input and the scholarly output.

So, coming back to that earlier question, I do not want to get into details of some concepts of how things might be measured. I think there are two tasks: defining what are the things you want to measure and for what purpose, and then, really trying to define them absolutely clearly and enforcing it down the line so that when you get back the statistics, you can rely on them.

MR. HAAS: Several times in Mr. Marcus' reflections, he looked at ways of establishing the incremental costs of new activities or of specific activities. Let me go to the government contract side of things, where a number of libraries have established costs, and these studies have been worked into the negotiation process in establishing the overhead rate. One of the things that has always bothered me on this question of incremental costs is that, really, I think that when any agency is coming to a university and asking it to conduct research, it is buying not only a piece of the current action, but it is benefitting from the incredibly long capital investment that the university has made, especially in the library field. Many of the studies that come to a university are really coming there because the university has made an investment over the years in building a multi-million volume collection. Is it valid to think that we should recover not only incremental costs for the specific piece of activity, but should not there be a price tag, a rent for making use of that capital investment?

MR. MARCUS: Are you sure you are not an economist? Of course, this brings all the more closely the analogy to the public utility, because when A T & T comes up for the tariff filing, it says, "These are our costs of services based on labor, materials, etc., but we are also entitled to a rate of return on our investment. There is an equity that stockholders put in that business; it is there; it is necessary for doing the business; and there ought to be a rate of return on it compensating for that."

I think that this is an extremely valid argument, even when you talk about the stock or investment made in libraries. At the very elementary level, you can think of your stock as actually going through some rate of depreciation; and the rate of depreciation in all accounting, in all economic cost studies, is considered part of current costs. That depreciation really suggests that you have to recover the cost of your earlier investment by some period. Now, what is going to be that depreciation period and how to calculate it is a quite complex question. But I think you are right in suggesting that what you are offering to the contracting agency is an investment that has been made. And what they are getting now are the services flowing from that investment and some rate of return and -- let me not call it rate of return -- some user charge is the appropriate payment for that input, which is made available to it.

MR. HAAS: Is this related to the interlibrary loan question as well?

MR. MARCUS: Yes, one can generalize on your point and suggest that besides all the out-of-pocket expenses, the variable costs, with which we are very familiar, there ought to be a charge for the capital invested, because that capital is an input in your process. Analogously, when you rent an apartment, if the landlord were only to charge you for his current operating costs, you would probably be very happy about it, but I do not think he is going to put up any buildings. He is charging you for the services, and the services are measured by some charge imputed against his total investment. So, in a new study, that should be taken into account.

VOICE: I guess that I will have to rise on a point of personal privilege. You know, Mr. Haas was talking about interlibrary loan costs. Professor Marcus, in the words of the economist, you have your P Q scale with the price on one side and your quantity -- the supply/demand -- where you establish a price. The supply of library services begins someplace up the scale. For us to do nothing, it costs us a certain sum of money. You, as a library user, are not prepared to pay anything; you say it is a no-price situation. Now as a library user, are you prepared to pay for library services? If you go to Rutgers and you make an agreement with Rutgers that I will use your library and you will provide me services for free, but you want to borrow something from Columbia. Are you prepared to pay for this? And where does it fit into your supply/demand? Where do the supply/demand lines pass on this? I do not think they cross.

MR. MARCUS: First of all, the question, "Am I prepared...?" I think is misleading. Are we prepared to pay double the price of fuel that we are paying today? Are housewives prepared to pay for grains 100 percent more than they paid a year ago? If you had asked them "Are you prepared?", they would say "No, absolutely not." We turn around and we look and we say, "Are they paying for it?" Yes, they are; where they are not paying for it, fine, they are cutting some of their consumption. So I think there is a danger in asking whether people are prepared to do something or not. Usually, first of all they tend to imagine that you are going to base your policy on that, and if I am a smart customer, I am going to tell you, "No, I am not prepared to...", in particular, if I am a heavy user. Then I figure somebody else is going to pay a share.

If we look at the history of economic behavior, we find that people in the long run adjust to the underlying economic conditions. They adjust in one of two ways: they cut their consumption in some parts where they feel that the increased price is not worth it, or they bear the price increase and give up something else. If you think about long-run policy, this is the only policy that society can afford to follow because ultimately these costs have to be borne.

Let me now go to specifics, to the case of a reserve room. I am a user of the reserve room; I am an instructor, one of those instructors who sends lists to the reserve room to put books on the shelf. The price, to me, as an instructor, of adding another five books on that list is zero. In fact, I may impress my students; I may impress my chairman; and there may be a chance, one in a million, that somebody would use it. So, from the user's point of view, you, as a librarian, are giving a signal to me that this activity is costly, because I am going to behave based on the signals that you send me. I am not going to stop and think maybe there is a real cost and what is it? Is it a quarter, is it a dollar, is it $10? I do not know what it is. I behave in line with the messages you send me. Suppose you now decide that this reserve room activity, based on all kinds of qualitative judgments, may be being abused by some departments, may not be taken very seriously, which means, given again the budget constraints that I introduced before, that that abuse results in the sacrifice of other activities where expansion would be desirable. One policy at that point would be to debit a department, an accounting debit based on the use of the reserve room facilities. And if the Economics Department at the end of the year is going to get a very heavy debit because it has used it quite a bit, at that point there are several things that might happen. First of all, you will have some notion of the distribution. And secondly, the administration will be able to come in and say that our reserve room activities associated with our cost study (because at that point we will be able to point out what are the costs to the library of this reserve room activity) really reduce the effectiveness of other operations of the library. You can, at that point, devise all kinds of pricing schemes which do not suggest that the librarian is going to collect money, but you will have charging in accordance with usage. And I submit to you that here is one activity, based on my own personal knowledge, where I think that the saving in resources may result in greater overall productivity in other areas.

MR. VOIGT: Maybe this is the best question at this point. It deals with how can we get and keep this kind of statistical survey up-to-date? There has been a good deal of warning in this book and this morning that these are data that do not reflect today's activities because of the fact that there has been a change in the way libraries have been operating. The question is whether the volume of publication of scholarly material is really increasing at the rate it has been. Many libraries are no longer growing at the rates that they were; the so-called exponential growth has turned into perhaps a minus exponent at this point. It seems that if we really are to use this kind of data for planning as of today, we need statistics of today. The question I would like to ask Professor Marcus is the question of how he sees the best method of bringing this kind of data up-to-date and keeping it up-to-date? Is this something that can be done? And how could it be done?

MR. MARCUS: I think the Association of Research Libraries has an excellent basis on which to build in this regard. You are collecting data; you are collecting it promptly, and this is the first essential in any cost study. I think, as I pointed out before, it would be good if, as you design your statistic, you consider what uses you want to make of it. And I think that one could conceivably do almost a computerized annual study which would be somewhat different from what we have had here, but quite useful, based on the data for the research libraries. The problem in relying on Office of Education data is that by the time the Office collects them, and you get and decipher the tapes, you are far outside the period. But I think that given the structure of the ARL and the reporting practices that you have, it would appear to me that it should be thoroughly straightforward and not too time-consuming a task to try and systematize the activity and provide annualized cost analyses.

* * * *

BUSINESS MEETING

MR. HOPP: At this point in the last few business meetings we have had the reports from our various commissioners. As you know, [illegible] the end of the conference in January, all committees and task forces and commissions were in a sense dismissed. We have spent most of the time up until now recreating these various working groups. And so, this has left very little time for the commissioners to cope with some of the issues that they are to be considering, and in fact, some commissions have not even met. So we will not today have any reports from any commissioners.

On the other hand, the new modus operandi is that the committees and the task forces now, instead of reporting to the commissioners as they had done previously, are working directly with the ARL office. Stephen McCarthy in his Executive Director's report will be reporting to you on the various things that have happened in the committee structure.

The first item on the agenda is a report of the Interlibrary Loan Committee; David Weber is chairman.

* * * *

Membership Vote on Interlibrary Loan Fees

MR. WEBER: I trust everyone has a copy of the text that Mr. Lucker read this morning. It is my intention to move each of the six items of the text one at a time and see what the outcome is. The committee has sequenced these in a way that, we believe, the second one follows only if the first is in the affirmative, and so on. I might say that the Board of Directors went over this carefully at their meeting on Wednesday afternoon. So it at least has passed their judgement as a useful form of the text.

MR. LORENZ: Point of order. I do not want to be constitutionally obnoxious on this, but could we have some explanation of the statement: "subject to ascertaining their conformity with governmental regulations." Has that been explained at all?

MR. WEBER: No, it has not been explained. It is merely that in anything of this magnitude where the Association acts, it is well to have legal counsel review it to be sure that there is nothing in conflict.

MR. LORENZ: Is there a particular government regulation you have in mind here that needs to be checked?

MR. McCARTHY: This can be read as having an element of price-fixing. That is the only aspect of it that we are aware of, but we have not had time to have it thoroughly checked out by our attorney, and, therefore, it seemed best to put in that qualifying phrase. Our attorney has written us a letter after a quick examination of the report saying there is this question, which would need to be investigated, if the Association proposes to go ahead with it.

MR. WEBER: Then, if it is your pleasure, on behalf of the Committee on Interlibrary Loan, I move the adoption of the first item, namely: "A fee is to be charged if the lender wishes, for filled interlibrary loan requests."

MR. HOPP: I think, with that motion coming from a Committee, we are now ready for discussion.

MR. MASON: I think this is a great leap backward. We have, over the last ten years, painfully, and against most of the inclinations of research libraries, come to understand each other as people we can depend on because we are not self-sufficient. We have been able to describe in our collection building policies to our faculty members, those things that they do not have to have immediately on these premises because they are on some other premises. And we are suddenly about to erect a series of roadblocks along the way. I think that the effect this would have, actually, on the flow of interlibrary loan volume has been seriously underestimated, because clearly, if we start it, it is going to become a general thing throughout the profession, and it is going to be used as a means for solving fiscal contingencies which exist everywhere along the way.

I am old enough to have been in at the beginning of the recent movement on toll bridges and toll roads which were great ideas when they came in; we were going to charge 25¢ passage for the George Washington Bridge for six or eight years, when it would be paid for, including a profit; after that use of the bridge was to be free. And the net result of this is that, when I used to drive from Long Island to my native Connecticut on these great roadways made to expedite traffic, I would be stopped every seven miles and backed up for five minutes to drop a dime in a basket. This is exactly the effect it would have on interlibrary loans.

I was glad to hear from John Humphry this morning the best argument I have heard against the fee system. He seemed to be saying out of the side of his mouth (how seriously I could not tell) that if a fee is imposed, NYSILL's are going to spring up all around the country; and this of course could not happen, because the conditions in New York, which is not part of the United States anymore, and atypical in all kinds of ways, do not exist anywhere else. First of all, the strength of the libraries in that state is remarkable. Of the first eight contractual libraries as backups in that system (which worked brilliantly well for us), seven of them were in New York City. It had an extremely strong central State Library. It had a state system of universities and colleges that has grown up since the Second World War, all of them underbooked, and which had from the beginning to depend on each other. And all of these dynamics rolled together to make a good state-subsidized system, but the chances of bringing this off in most of the 50 states would be minimal.

I too join Mr. Chapin in suspecting the gross figures to show how much certain institutions are imbalanced. I know that the larger and stronger libraries such as Yale, where I handled interlibrary loans from 1939 to 1942 had imbalances even then. But Yale itself had a certain fixed commitment that cannot be shaken out of those figures by charging fees. They are embattled in the city of New Haven, which has been doing very bad things about the expansion of that university physically, and they have been counterbalancing this by doing certain socially good things, one of which was extending in various kinds of ways on the premises and through interlibrary loans, its commitments to colleges in the state of Connecticut. Yale is not going to be able to eliminate a whole range of those necessary loans. Harvard is in the same position. If they can get past the public opinion that they are sitting on a billion dollars, ground from the bones of widows and children by robber barons of nine generations, they still are faced with very large local commitments to a very expansive range of colleges and universities, and these are going to remain in their interlibrary loan statistics. They are not going to get out of their difficulties easily. I do think there may be 10 or 11 major collections in this country that perform interlibrary loan services that overburden the state; they should charge fees. They could turn back interlibrary loans now that are not verified and this would solve half of their problems. But they should charge fees. They should probably be able to depend on the fact that those requests coming to them after that are important. Fees will greatly cut their costs and their burdens. But attempting to mask it by getting a vote from the Association of Research Libraries, three-quarters of whose members are not major research libraries, seems to me is a totally misguided step. I hope we vote this down heavily.

MR: ATKINSON: Like every library Ohio State has a whole series of commitments we have made to the state, to local agencies, to businesses, state agencies and so forth. The very act of having to distinguish the free from the non-free, the partially charged from the charged would produce another burden that I, frankly, am not willing to accept. Secondly, this, in fact, will raise the real cost of lending an item; if you add a system for accounting for it, it is going to cost more. We are then raising the price of library service; attempting to equalize it but still raising it. In the end, a uniform payment will not change the patterns of borrowing. If it were an un-uniform payment system, it might well change the patterns of borrowing. But if we are interested in removing the burden of excess lending from large institutions, better that we work out some scheme of non-uniform payments. And last, since Mr. Weber paints a scenario this morning about what was going on over the next couple of years, let me add to that scenario just a little bit.

Let us assume that in that process, around 1976 as the various committees are working out the schemes, that the Library of Congress, which probably in its evaluation of whether or not to accept this kind of thing, has decided that it would be unwise at the moment to charge fees. Nobody has said that, but it is one of the options open to LC and it is a good likelihood that they would not be able, politically at least, to do much fee charging. Let us say that they are, in fact, not in the business, but they are in front of one of their many committee hearings and, as the Librarian of Congress is explaining the need for increased salaries for more catalogers for a larger NPAC program or something, some member of that committee, perhaps a representative from Ohio or some state which has had irate, not altogether unjustified complaints from their constituents about the biggies getting more, and doing bad things to small libraries, looks down and says, "Well, why should we give you money for an NPAC program to do cataloging for those same bad, large institutions who are sucking away the federal support?" Well, nevertheless, the thing passes, but were the Library of Congress, and it probably is, sensitive to that kind of thing, inevitably, a response has to be made to a national feeling. Probably there will follow that scenario some transfer of catalogers now cataloging Persian, now cataloging Chinese, now cataloging the research materials that we use, to a great, expanded interlibrary loan situation.

I can see arising from this kind of action a national lending library from the Library of Congress, at the expense of the support we get. What, in fact, we are trading is the indirect extramural support that we get in an effort to subsidize the direct extramural support that we give. And I suspect that we get far more than we give, and we will pay for it. Because, in the end, I suppose the point of it all is that libraries' service cannot be considered in one piece and then another piece and another piece; that libraries' services are expensive, and that those expenses are related; that if we in fact burden and add to the cost and fiddle with the costs on one side, we are going to affect other library costs. And we will pay for it; we will not get out of paying for it. I see no reason at all for this Association to adopt the resolution.

MR. ROGERS: I am indebted to Ellsworth Mason for speaking for Yale. I was much entertained by Mr. Chapin this morning; I think we need a lightness at these meetings. But if I may misquote Shakespeare: "That which is laughable to the general cannot help but make the serious weep."

There are many things that have happened today that I think have obscured this issue, and I would like to speak to several of them. We heard this morning that it was wrong to include the statistics of the regional medical libraries here because we were being paid for these. I submit to you that we are not beginning to be paid what it really costs; we are being paid a fraction of that. That is one of the things that is wrong. If we had realistic figures for this, perhaps we would be reimbursed in a way that we should be for the expense that we are going to.

It was said this morning that we are not bothering with unfilled requests; that we are just charging for filled requests. This is a superficial interpretation of the document that was circulated to this Association. It was made quite clear that the unfilled factor was put into the charges for the filled loans, so that in effect, the charges for the filled loans took into account costs for those that were unfilled.

This first item does not require anybody who does not wish to charge to do so. This was iterated at the discussion at mid-winter meeting, it seems to me that it needs to be said again and again here: no one has to charge. I can understand where a publicly-supported institution which, in effect, is being given staff to do this sort of thing, looks at this differently from a privately-supported institution which is having to support interlibrary loan and, at the same time, cut another 500 subscriptions to scientific periodicals, which is exactly what we are doing right now. And there are other needs of our libraries that cannot be filled because we do not have the money; we are not "fat cats."

I really do not sympathize with the position of the American Library Association Reference and Adult Services Division; it is very easy for the people who are on the receiving end of this to say, "You must not interrupt the flow of information; you should keep on giving; you should do this whether you get anything for it or not." We heard this morning that if you spend your money on one thing, it is not available for something else. This is very apparent, I think, to any library director. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science says, "Stay away from this because it is going to obscure the copyright issue." The copyright issue is being obscured every day with red herrings, and this is another one. We are not proposing to charge, really, for the use of the materials. The fact is that some of us went to the trouble to buy expensive collections and kept them for centuries. All we are proposing to do is to charge direct costs, and I do not see how that can be twisted into a copyright issue. But I must not underestimate the opposition.

I served on an advisory committee of the Office of Education several years ago where it was completely within their power under the Higher Education Act to change the regulations in such a way so that there would be incentives for the lending library to get some recognition in federal aid for what they were giving; they refused to accept that principle. And if you think, by simply sitting around and postponing this issue that somehow or other we are going to get federal subsidy or state subsidy, I think you are dreaming. One of the ways to exert some leverage is to put in a system like this, and then, instead of having 80 members of the ARL supporting this issue, we might have several thousand libraries working on Congress to give recognition to those libraries that are big net lenders. Thank you.

MR. BOSS: I come from a publicly-supported state institution and I agree with what Mr. Rogers has just said. We are, like so many of you, funded on the basis of a formula that basically uses weighted, credit hour production as a basis for determining library support, which means then that our funds are appropriated to us on the basis of the number of people we must serve on our campus. At the present time, we are diverting we estimate some $57,000 per year in order to provide materials to the faculty and students of other campuses in the state of Tennessee for which we are not, in any way under the formula now reimbursed. It is our feeling that were the ARL to adopt this position for a large number of libraries to begin to start charging, and were we to indicate our intent to join in this type of an action, that we would have the formula adjusted to reflect the expenses that we are now incurring for providing this kind of service. In fact, the Executive Director of our Tennesses Higher Education Commission and several members of the Commission have indicated that if there were a national movement in this direction, that they would feel that the political climate would be right to alter the formula in order to provide us with this kind of support. This is something they feel that they could not now do.

MR. SPARKS: There is a question that I wanted to ask the committee this morning, and it is really preliminary to some of the discussion; it is a point of information. Mr. McCarthy wrote letters, and I wanted to ask whether those letters had gone to the Council of Graduate Schools and to the American Council on Education.

What we are proposing here, in some measure, is an increase in the cost of graduate education and an increase in the cost of faculty research. I suspect that we should not be proposing this without consulting with our colleagues who teach and who do research; my academic sensibilities are offended by not having consulted with them. There is also, perhaps, a missed opportunity. I do not see how stipends for graduate research can be much increased, although they might be, but it does seem to me that research grants could include the cost of interlibrary loan.

I know we have talked about government subsidy of this kind of work; however, we know that the government in the United States and in Canada I suppose too is greatly dependent on a number of jurisdictions, none of which seem to operate together. New York State is a paragon of good political organization, but there are many areas of the United States that are not well organized, and funding may not be forthcoming for many years. We have to ask ourselves, then, where are the funds coming from? Are we going to ask our graduate students and our faculty to provide these funds, or our administration to provide them through increased budgets for ourselves? I think we have to raise these questions and so, I am interested to know whether we had been in contact with these organizations in the educational community.

MR. McCARTHY: We wrote to library associations, not to educational organizations.

MR. SPARKS: Just to make a rhetorical observation then, I think this organization has something of an obligation to the educational community so to communicate, either the results of this discussion this afternoon, or to postpone decision this afternoon until we have consulted with them.

MR. WAGMAN: It is obvious that all of us have different circumstances and are governed by different conditions. Mr. Rogers at Yale and Mr. Bryant at Harvard are in one box; Mr. Boss at Tennessee is in a different category; Mr. Chapin and I are still in a different category. In fact, I am in a different box than he is, and neither Mr. Chapin nor I could possibly charge for interlibrary loans within our state. We would not get away with it and we would not try. In my case the state supports an access office whereby I hire people in order to provide the loans of materials and free copies to the libraries within the state; it is considering extending this and setting up another one in Chapin's shop; and perhaps a third one in the Detroit Public Library. So, everybody has a different set of circumstances. I do not see why we have to have a formal action by the ARL which sets up a fairly strict pattern, that says, "You will do thus and so, except if you do not want to, you do not have to." Why do not we simply admit the fact that there are certain libraries that are suffering and cannot stand the interlibrary loan arrangement as it is now? They are spending more on it than they possibly can. We really should not try to force them out of the magnanimity of our own hearts to do something that they cannot afford to do. They have done very well for a very long period of time. In my case, I lend 28,000 items a year and I borrow 3,500; and if one medical school professor did not do an annual bibliography, I would borrow maybe 1,500 or 2,000. At the same time, I can not possibly charge for interlibrary loans; I do not intend to. Why do not we simply content ourselves by resolving that the ARL supports the libraries that are members of the ARL that feel that they have to make charges for interlibrary loans and believe that they should, and let it go at that? Let them work out their charges with our support and with our endorsement, rather than having an elaborate, set system. I can offer this as a compromise to the present situation.

MR. HOPP: Fred, I just will raise the question with you, that was what I thought the item said, in essence: "A fee is to be charged if the lender wishes..."

MR. WAGMAN: I know, but it puts it on a slightly different basis, it seems to me. It sets up a rather elaborate mechanism and says, "This is ARL's position, ARL's policy; you do not have to support it." I think what we need to say is that ARL supports the libraries that must charge, or feel they must charge, a fee, and let it go at that and not take a firm position that excites everybody.

MR. HOPP: As it now stands, we are still debating the proposition before us, unless you wish to put a substitute motion in.

MR. WAGMAN: I would make this as a substitute motion, that the ARL resolves (I have not written this out and I will leave it to a committee to write this out for me), that it supports its member libraries who find it necessary to charge a fee for interlibrary loan. [The motion was seconded.]

I have not wrapped this with the necessary preambles. If the group consents, I would leave it with the Executive Director to put in the proper wording here, to make this more palatable to everybody.

MR. HOPP: Unless someone corrects me, I think a substitute motion is debatable.

MR. DE GENNARO: I had a comment which was, perhaps, pertinent to the previous motion but I think is also pertinent to this. It is kind of an effort at further compromise. It seems to be that the Association has before it, right now, two important and related matters: one is the interlibrary loan fee and the other is the SILC proposition, the establishment of a system for interlibrary loan communication. I have a feeling that we may have these two things out of sequence. It would seem to me that it would be more important, and a better strategy to concentrate on implementing the SILC proposal first, following the New York State model that we heard about this morning. If we were to concentrate on doing that for the next couple of years, and delay the charging of fees until that system was in effect and producing accurate statistics so that we did not have to get into the kind of statistical gymnastics that Mr. Chapin was involved in this morning, we would get some accurate statistics of who is borrowing what from whom, and the nature of the material and so on. And after that were in effect for a while, one could then begin to deal with the question of interlibrary loan fees in a much more accurate and professional way.

MR. HAMLIN: I do not wish to be in the position of moving an amendment to the amendment. I favor Mr. Wagman's amendment. I would feel a little better if the ARL suggested a uniform fee to such institutions as wish to charge of $3.00 to non-profit institutions, and $7.00 to others. In other words, I would like to avoid this picture of Harvard deciding it was going to charge $4.00 and Yale $3.50 and Chicago $5.00 and that sort of thing. I would prefer to see a recommended standard fee for these institutions.

MR. WAGMAN: I have no objection to our deciding what the fee should be, with the concurrence of the libraries that want to charge it; but I do not see why we should discriminate from the point of charging less than it costs. Three dollars as a charge for an interlibrary loan is a gift; it costs a lot more than that. If it is costing Harvard and Yale and Columbia $7.00 for an interlibrary loan, let them charge $7.00. Why $7.00 to a commercial firm and $3.00 to a library? It is a matter of costs that we are talking about, not discrimination of one kind or another.

MR. HAAS: I guess I have got a random mix of reactions thus far. One reaction to Mr. Sparks: what we are talking about is not increasing the cost of graduate education; those costs are already there. What we are talking about is a mechanism for making sure the costs are charged out to the right department. I think Mr. Shepherd might talk a little bit on the benefits of NYSILL because he knows them better than I through his longer experience. I guess what I have got in the back of my mind is this: we have got a mixed set of objectives that are conflicting in part, which is the reason for the problem here. First, none of us wants to put financial constraints on access to information. We all want to improve access to information. We all want to make full use of national resources wherever they are. We want to end the subsidy of interlibrary lending by the major lenders, which is the present situation. And perhaps, most of all, we want to promote change in operating philosophy of research libraries across the country.

Now, to accomplish these things, it seems that we certainly need to develop a properly funded system for interlibrary lending. And this means, supporting Mr. De Gennaro's idea that we have got really to establish the costs for the segments of this process because, in the abstract, what we are really talking about is the creation of something that might be called an information access fund, a national pool of dollars; they can come in part form the State of New York; they can come out of the pockets of Time-Life Incorporated; they can come from federal grants. But what we are trying to identify is enough money available in the national aggregate to really influence change and improve the system of access to information on a national scale without having that process subsidized by a relatively small number of components. I think I would support Mr. Wagman's approach here that step one is to make certain that we face up to reality, and if the costs are such, and I would say that they are, that we can no longer continue to bear them ourselves, a way has got to be found to recover those costs. I agree with Mr. De Gennaro, a mechanism for communication among libraries on a national basis to expedite access to recorded information is ultimately a necessary thing. And the SILC project, as such or in some variant, needs to go the next step; whether it will ultimately go the final step, I do not know. I guess I would park that.

MR. SHEPHERD: Somewhat as a testimonial in favor of the movement, based on our experience, participating in the New York network, NYSILL, were it not for the little compensation we get for that part of our work, I could not provide the service to the faculty and the students that we do. We are now lending about 3,000 items a month, which is perhaps higher than most research libraries here, because this fund enables us to staff and get the machinery to do a good job for our own people. And there is something good about this, I think.

MR. BRYANT: I would like to speak in support of Mr. Wagman's compromise, if we can call it that. It seems to me that as Mr. Haas has said just a few minutes ago, we are talking in the longer term about a way of financing the interchange of information in this country. There cannot be a person in this room who is not devoting his life to essentially this general matter of making information available to scholars. This is what this is all about.

There is the question, however, of who pays for what precise part of it and when. I think that most of us in the room probably see the long-term solution to this problem, if solution there ever is in an identifiable way. But the long-term answer to this must lie, I think, in some form of governmental subsidy, whether it is federal in the end, or a series of NYSILL's or whatever. But certainly, among the 50 states, there can never be 50 identical or even parallel systems. I think, in the long term, we are going to have to have some kind of federal subsidy. I think, furthermore, that we are in fact working towards this.

Now, with respect to the short-term; there are the libraries represented by a number of us here who are very greatly in the net lending position. It happens that many of these very libraries happen to be private, and we do not have access to public funding in the normal sense of the term. In order to continue to provide this service, (which we want very much indeed to do; we regard ourselves as partly in business to do this), and in order to be able to maintain the collecting level which, in turn, permits us to provide these materials, we are going to have to have some kind of outside support in the short-term. Some sort of charging for these services is, I think, the only possible way the Association and the libraries of which I speak can continue to be able to support scholarship in this particular way.

MR. WEBER: I would like it to be clear that the ARL committee has not yet met. It meets this evening for the first time. It was our belief that we should try to put before you, in a useful form, the sense of the three advisory committees which, in January spent a whole day going over these reports.

May I ask for a point of clarification? I would like to ask Mr. Wagman whether I understood that his substitute motion would be interpreted as supporting fees without there being a standard charge which, I would conclude, means that a coupon system might work but that there could be a vast variety of charges. This would, presumably, result in a good deal more time on the part of interlibrary loan staff and the management of the payments system itself and thus, I suppose, it is a different combined choice from the options that Vernon Palmour in his report put before the Association.

MR. WAGMAN: My feeling about it is this: there are many of us that are not going to charge, and that are not able to charge. The balance between what we are being paid to provide now and other loans out of state and loans coming in and so forth would not justify our bothering to make charges. There are others that cannot charge for other reasons, and will not charge. There are a certain number here that will. It seems to me that the fee ought to be standard if it is possible, but the fee should be based on actual costs to be worked out with those libraries. If that is already done, if it is $7.00, fine. The amount of the fee should be adjusted from time to time. Rather than have a hit-or-miss system of pricing, it seems to me that some sort of agreement could be reached by the libraries. There are only 93 of us. Of that number, only a handful, really, are going to be involved in charging for interlibrary loan. Why can not this be worked out with them in terms of what their costs actually are in some mutually agreeable way. I leave it to those who are going to be charging as to whether this is feasible or not. I do not know.

MR. DAVIDSON: I think the compromise is not very dramatic. The original motion would permit us in California to respond to state pressure from Sacramento to charge commercial organizations a fee. And while I do not know whether it is right or wrong to charge commercial operations a fee, we are under that pressure. This may be a small point. But in general, I am opposed to the compromise and in favor of the greater drama of the original proposal. I am in support of the original motion.

MR. HUMPHRY: I realize I have already spoken once on this subject, but in terms of Mr. Wagman's proposal, I see it as not that much different in terms of the fact that the committee's proposal is permissive only. It does not have any mandate with it. And therefore, I fail to see what Mr. Wagman's proposal would do that is different from the committee's proposal. If the libraries that are net lenders and where funds are a major problem are going to make a decision as to some action to be taken, what is the difference between that being done in terms of an ARL-supported position versus Mr. Wagman's?

MR. WAGMAN: Not a great deal, except I think there is a good deal of opposition to the statement as it is now written; and there might be less to the amendment that I proposed. The fact remains, I think, that all I am trying to say is that the ARL, instead of going into a fairly elaborate proposal here which says, "You will do thus and so and thus and so, unless you do not want to" -- would simply say that "We support those institutions that feel they must charge a fee," and let them work out their fate in terms of what the fee should be.

MR. HARRER: It was my impression that we were suggesting to the membership at this point that these points might be taken up one at a time, and that the Board or the committee would then get in essence what might be a straw vote on how the members of the Association reacted to the various aspects which seem to be included in the Westat study. These are aspects of an interlibrary loan relationship which we have not heretofore had, that are proposed here. And obviously, the first item is, "a fee is to be charged if you want to." In other words, if a library thinks it has got to charge a fee, it can charge a fee. And all we are saying is, would it be all right if anybody charged a fee? Would ARL support a library in charging a fee? The second one will be how much the fee will be to certain types of institutions; we can vote that one down or throw it out or say "No, we do not want that kind of structure." This, I thought, was what we were doing.

Now, I am a little confused because I do not understand whether Mr. Wagman's motion is a statement to take the place of all six of these, or to take the place of this whole sheet; or whether it is a change of wording to take the place of only number one. If it does that, I am perfectly willing to vote for it because it seems to me to say the same thing as number one says. May I ask then is this motion that Frederick Wagman is proposing to take the place of the whole resolution or just item number one?

MR. HOPP: May I first say that nothing has been presented except item one, so the substitute could only be for item one. Now, if you want to make it more general, a motion would have to be made.

MR. WAGMAN: May I amend my amended motion? This is an explication of my amendment to the motion, namely that we act by saying that we support the libraries that feel they have to, want to, must charge a fee. The determination of the rest of the matters in the resolution before us should be made by the committee working with those libraries as to what that fee shall be. My action then would eliminate the need for voting on the rest of the proposal.

MR. HOPP: I find myself in a kind of a parliamentary morass here, because I can only interpret that we have presented one thing and you have made a substitute motion for it. We have not presented the rest of it yet. In order to get out of this, I suggest that we vote on Mr. Wagman's motion as he has presented it, and then we move on to the next resolution for a vote, and at that point, if you want to, we can kill it.

MR. WAGMAN: I will amend the motion that has been made to say that the ARL supports the libraries that feel they must charge a fee for interlibrary loans.

VOICE: I would like to speak against Frederick Wagman's amendment on the grounds that I think many of the people in the room that do not charge will not want to support those who do. I do not want to have to go to my faculty and my administration and say, "I support this charge on the part of the great private institutions which will make our research more costly." And I would hope that, regardless of what happens to the original motion, ARL will not support publicly and say we endorse these people and what they are doing to us. I feel that they have a social responsibility to the less-endowed that they should fulfill.

VOICE: I would like to point out that one of the comments made during the course of this early debate was that, if you voted down number one, you would not consider points two, three, four, five and six.

MR. HOPP: That is right.

VOICE: In effect then, accepting the substitute motion, you would vote against item number one and thus not consider two, three, four, five and six.

MR. WAGMAN: I am perfectly willing to confine myself to number one.

MR. HOPP: Mr. Wagman said he was perfectly willing to confine himself to number one. In order to get through this morass, let us confine ourselves to number one. I believe we are ready for the question which is, in essence, as I understand it: "The ARL resolves that it supports its member libraries who find it necessary to charge for interlibrary loans." [A vote was taken and the substitute motion carried]. Now we will move on to number two.

MR. WEBER: I move that "a fee will initially be $3 to nonprofit institutions." [The motion was seconded].

MR. WAGMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer a substitute motion. The substitute motion is to the effect that the fee is to be determined by our Interlibrary Loan Committee in conjunction with the libraries that are considering charging a fee in terms of their actual costs. [The motion was seconded].

MR. DE GENNARO: Could I ask for a point of clarification: does the substitute motion mean that the Interlibrary Loan Committee has to determine those institutions which might use such a system? That will take canvassing members of ARL and finding out what they believe their costs are and coming to some consensus as to a reasonable figure, and presenting that to the ARL Board of Directors which then would make the decision to support it or not. Am I correct? That would be the consequence?

MR. HOPP: That would have been my interpretation. Mr. Wagman, is this in agreement with yours?

MR. WAGMAN: I do not know how expeditious this would be. I would leave this to David Weber, how quickly it can be done; whether it can be done by a mail vote; or how rapidly it would take place. But it seems to me that if it is important that there be some agreement as to a standard fee, that agreement should be made with the people who are going to charge it. If the $7 fee is agreeable to these people rather than the $3 fee, maybe it can be done very quickly.

MR. BOSS: I certainly do not object to the idea that the level of the fee ought to be determined on the basis of negotiation among those who actually plan to charge a fee. I do hope, however, it will be a standard fee. As I interpret our state and institutional requirements, I am sure they are not too different from those of most of your institutions. We can purchase coupons, receive an invoice and pay that invoice and minimize the paper work. If, on the other hand, it is a variable fee, we are going to have to request each institution, each time it provides us with an interlibrary loan, to send us an invoice in triplicate against which we would then make payment. I would much rather see some of the institutions make a slight profit -- those that have lower costs than this fixed fee that is set -- than go through the hassle of receiving your invoices in triplicate several thousand times each year.

MR. WAGMAN: I would be delighted, if you will permit me under your parliamentary rules to insert the word "standard fee."

MR. DE GENNARO: But if that comes back to the ARL Board, and the Board has to pass on it, will not it defeat the purpose of Mr. Wagman's original motion, which was to get the ARL, as an Association, out of this business?

MR. WAGMAN: I had no concern about whether it would go to the ARL Board or not. I was just concerned that there be some mechanism to bring these people together to establish a standard fee. I am not arguing for us to come back to the ARL Board or that ARL approve a specific fee. All I am saying is that we should support the libraries that charge; we passed that. Two, that there ought to be a standard fee and if they need some help in deciding what the standard fee should be, our committee might be helpful. If they can do it without the committee, fine. I do not insist that it go back to the Board.

MR. McNIFF: I wonder if we are setting a precedent here? Are we going to have ARL backing standard fees for various library operations? We are talking about one element of access and only one element of access. We already have varying fees for access to use of collections in a number of our libraries. We have varying fees for the use of computer data bases in our libraries. Are we going to have this matter brought up each time for ARL general consensus on a standard fee? I am just raising this as a question of possible future procedures for the Association.

MR. CHAPIN: Since we are all writing scenarios today, if we go through with the rest of Mr. Wagman's amendments, we will come right back to the coupon system. It seems to me that the thrust of the first substitute motion was that certain libraries have a problem and certain libraries want to charge for interlibrary loan fees, and the Association has said, "We recognize this problem; and God bless you and thank you for all the help you have given in the past, but go ahead and charge a fee." But I would agree that if this is indeed a problem that the fee would recover costs;

the library should say, "If you want to borrow books from us, it is going to cost you $7.50 or it is going to cost $8.00 or something like that. But if we go down this series of substitute motions, pretty soon we are going to get a standard fee; we are going to get coupons; the Association is going to be involved with passing out coupons all the way through. It seems to me, this is a decision made by the individual libraries and we have said, with the first substitute motion, "we understand; we know you have a problem; go ahead and charge."

MR. BERTHEL: This is merely an opinion, but I feel somewhat the way Mr. Chapin does in respect to going down each of these items. I cannot help but question the validity of the assumption that the present environment, public opinion, if you wish, outside of our universities, is such that the strategy, as suggested by Mr. Rogers, behind such an action as is indicated in this document of the committee, would necessarily convince governments, either state or federal, in a period when they are increasing support to private institutions in a complex fashion, would necessarily prove to be more than an irritant to individual legislatures who have anything to do about these things. I think history suggests that when a period of stringency follows one of affluence, the emphasis on priorities changes in civilizations. And I felt there was this flaw in the morning discussion, in a way. Food, shelter and clothing are increasingly emphasized, and certain very valuable and even useful embellishments drop down in the list of priorities. I think we would do much better to be sure of our facts and figures, and not go to governments, or not attempt to change the views of government and public opinion, without first having these facts. Rather than do it fragmentarily on one aspect of our operation, we should continue to articulate to the best of our ability the real costs of reasearch library services and their real value to this civilization.

MR. LORENZ: Based on what has been said previously, I would move that we table number two, and therefore the balance of the document. [The motion was seconded. A vote was taken and the motion carried by a vote of 43 to 19].

MR. SPARKS: This is somewhat after-the-fact, but I think John Berthel's point is well made, that if we go to government together with our colleagues, the graduate deans who are concerned with graduate education together with our colleagues in the American Council on Education who operate universities, we will have a much stronger case, rather than attacking it piecemeal. And this was the point of what I had to say, that we have not yet consulted with the rest of those people who are concerned with higher education, and I think we have to do so.

MR. McCARTHY: We do happen to be aware of the position of the higher education associations: it is against all categorical grants to universities; they are opposed to grants for library services of any kind. You may say we should change that; that is a large order. But we cannot go hand in hand with them to seek support for interlibrary loans because we would not have anyone to hold hands with.

* * * *

International Education Project

MR. HOPP: I would now propose that we move on to the next item in the agenda: a report on the International Education Project by John Berthel, who is coordinator of the Library and Information Resources Task Force.

MR. BERTHEL: My assignment, as I understand it, is as follows: under the aegis of the American Council on Education and a committee it has created bearing the awesome title Government/Academic Interface Committee on International Education, and the task force appointed by this committee entitled Library and Information Resources Task Force, we are to consider the methods and means of providing adequate library and information services in support of the field of international education, area studies, in the decade of the 1970's. In pursuit of this objective, we are to assess the present situation and speculate concerning future needs. The time available for the completion of this study is terrifyingly short; a final report is expected in July of this year. The costs of the study are being borne by the American Council on Education and the Council on Library Resources. Stephen McCarthy has been of inestimatable value in guiding me into paths of inquiry that hopefully will prove useful. I am also supported by a task force of experts composed of academic specialists in area studies and by library directors and specialists who support these programs. I am attempting to develop some comprehension of the state-of-the-art at the present time; the nature of the programs libraries serve; user needs that remain unfilled; problems of bibliographical control; collections of special strength; the potential of cooperative and networking activities; and the potential of increased government/academic cooperation. My one preconception is that the free enterprise that characterized support of academic programs in the 1960's is not and will not be endemic to them in the 1970's.

* * * *

Schedule for ARL Meetings

MR. HOPP: Last year in his President's Report, William Budington indicated a continuing concern on the part of the Board and also among some of the membership, about the present schedule of ARL meetings. The present one-day meeting in January just preceding the midwinter meeting of the American Library Association, and the two-day meeting in May seem to have some weaknesses, primarily because of the short interval between the two meetings. By the time committees are appointed following the January meeting, there is too little time for them to meet and accomplish much before it is again time to prepare reports for the Spring meeting. From the ARL office's standpoint, it is virtually impossible to prepare the minutes for the

January meeting and distribute them to the membership prior to the May meeting.

For these and other reasons, the Board would like to get an expression of membership opinion on this issue. It was suggested that we state the issue at this business meeting, take a few minutes for discussion, and later poll the members by mail. To bring the issue before you for discussion, the Board has voted to recommend to you a two-day meeting in the Spring, possibly April which would be program-oriented, much the same as we now have in our Spring meetings, and a one-day session in the Fall, probably October or early November, that would be primarily business-oriented. The Board then would meet in January to conduct its business. I would like to propose we take five minutes simply to ventilate the issue at this point, with no action taken, but the action would then be determined by a mail ballot or mail solicitation later. Does anyone wish to express an opinion on our proposed membership meetings schedule?

MR. McCARTHY: Along with his absentee ballot with respect to the interlibrary loan proposal, David Laird left me this note: "This is my proxy vote in favor of the change in meeting time. I favor April and October or any similar biannual arrangement."

MR. McDONALD: I would like to speak in favor of this proposal. In addition to the difficulty of committees organizing and preparing reports for the Association, the problem of planning the major two-day meeting is complicated by the proximity of the midwinter session as it now stands. It has been our tendency to wait to perfect our ideas for meetings until January, and often the interval between then and May has not been sufficient in all cases to do precisely what we wanted. I think that is another argument in favor of separating them. I think you are on the right track. It is something that I suggested earlier on and it did not seem to have awakened much enthusiasm at that time; I am glad to see it coming back.

MR. TREYZ: I would like to support the motion, but I would like to ask a question. If we followed the old pattern of being tied to ALA, we would always be meeting in Chicago. Do you foresee us continuing to meet in one city for the Fall meeting or moving the meeting around the country as we do with our Spring meeting?

MR. McNIFF: I think there is an added advantage to having the meeting in October or November, because it would give a chance for some of the committees to meet. Instead of moving that Fall meeting around the country, I would be in favor of having the Fall meeting in Washington and having our Spring meeting rotate as it has in the past. But I think the change in schedule is an excellent idea.

MR. HOPP: You will be receiving a mail ballot sometime after this meeting so that we can bring to final resolution this rather long-standing problem.

* * * *

White House Conference on Library & Information Services

MR. HOPP: You have had distributed to you the resolution on the White House Conference on Library and Information Services. [The resolution is included in these Minutes as Appendix E]. I have asked Mr. McCarthy to bring us up-to-date as to Congressional activity with respect to this resolution.

MR. McCARTHY: There have been a number of resolutions with slight variations calling for a White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services. Bills have been introduced in the House and in the Senate. The Senate has acted on Senator Pell's Bill. Regarding the bills in the House, one is sponsored by John Brademas and some co-sponsors and another was sponsored by Vice-President Ford when he was a member of the House. This resolution in the House has been voted by the Special Education Subcommittee, Congressman Brademas chairs. It will shortly, I believe, go to the full House Committee on Education and Labor, and assuming favorable action there, the Senate and House versions of the bills would have to be harmonized. I am not aware that there are serious differences. Actually, as far as I can tell the intent is the same. So right now it is a matter of bringing this to a vote in the House Education and Labor Committee. The reason for bringing this resolution before you is that we would then transmit it to Chairman Perkins and members of the House Education and Labor Committee and urge action.

MR. HOPP: You have the resolution before you. I do not think it is necessary to read it. To bring it to the floor, someone needs to move the adoption of this resolution. [The resolution was adopted by voice vote of the membership].

* * * *

Research Libraries Group

MR. HOPP: I would like now to call on Rutherford Rogers to give us a brief report on the Research Libraries Group.

MR. ROGERS: I understand that the Rosenthal Report on the Research Library Group (RLG) reached many of you before this meeting, and I am going to assume that you either have or will obtain knowledge of the basic rationale of the program from that document or from the news stories that have appeared in the general and library press. This afternoon I wish to present on behalf of the four directors a brief statement on current activity. Perhaps there will be a little time for a few questions after I finish.

We are presently moving ahead on a variety of fronts. We are seeking three-year financial support to help us get underway, and we are reasonably optimistic about the prospects for such support. The directors have been meeting about every two weeks on the almost inconceivable variety of problems involved. One such meeting was with our respective legal counsels to explore the various options for establishing an independent corporation to serve as the vehicle for administering our joint efforts. Contrary to reports we have not yet incorporated, but our counsels are at work on a joint venture agreement to cover us initially. Incorporation will come later. We have begun the process of finding a director and of establishing and staffing the bibliographic center. With assistance of the telephone company and Western Union, we have developed communications strategies for both TWX and unlimited voice hookups, and have made a decision on the initial installations to be activated as soon as funding is assured.

Perhaps even more significant is the setting up of a series of committees and task forces. The most active task force so far has been the one on serials; it is well advanced in developing detailed procedures for decision-making on new and current subscriptions, and the members are about to tackle the big problem of back files and related preservation considerations. Task forces on computer applications and the bibliographic center have been less active but they are organized and functioning. Our top bibliographical control specialists are now organized and weighing the tremendously complex problems of standardization as it relates to inter-change of data. The heads of our respective collection development staffs are at work to identify the major collecting interests among the four institutions, and will develop strategies for cooperative efforts in areas other than serials.

Each director has devoted substantial effort to explaining RLG and building support for it among staff members, trustees and, in the case of university members, general university officers and faculty members. We detect an encouraging understanding and enthusiasm in all of these constituencies, but we do not underestimate the importance and difficulty of this part of our task. You may have seen the adverse reaction of publishers and booksellers to RLG. The comments are uninformed and suspiciously timely in bringing pressure on the Congress as it once again tries to move ahead on copyright legislation. There is nothing in our program that prohibits any member from acquiring any publication it considers essential. Secondly, we do not see an absolute drop in acquisitions expenditures but, rather, a leveling of the intolerable curve that certainly everyone in this room knows cannot be sustained at 1950-70 rates anyway. These factors will operate within the RLG context, not in the purchase of fewer publications than would otherwise be the case, but rather in a more organized expenditure that will permit multiple copies in any one institution where demand dictates such duplication, and at the same time, an assurance that lesser-used publications will be available to the extent that combined expenditures can be wisely deployed. And, since we are major supporters of the Center for Research Libraries, we are not overlooking its resources as an integral part of our plans and operations.

Finally, we wish to reiterate our strong desire to open our enterprise to membership of other libraries at an appropriate time. We speculated at the outset, and I speak of the time before even the four members were decided upon, that there would be plenty of problems to iron out with only three or four participants. I only hope that all of our prognostications might be equally accurate because the array of knotty issues has surpassed even our nightmares. And we are certain at this stage that were we dealing with the peculiarity of even a single additional institution, the prospects of developing a viable enterprise might be beyond reach. As things stand, we are irrepressibly optimistic that our aspirations are within the realm of possibility and that a new method of delivering information can be achieved. This can be done, not at the expense of publishers, booksellers, or other collaborative enterprises at the national and international level, but rather as a strong and harmonious element in a changed, more rational pattern of information delivery. To assure that our efforts will be consonant with other constituencies, it is our intention to form an appropriate consultative panel on which ARL interests can be represented.

* * * *

Systems and Procedures Exchange Center

MR. WEBSTER: I want to comment briefly on the new services that we are offering in the Office of University Library Management Studies through the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. As you know, we established this Center in August of last year to develop and make available documentation and analysis on the management activities of ARL member libraries. Most of you have appointed liason persons in your own institution to respond to our written requests for information and to provide us with documentation. We, in turn, have taken these materials and have organized them into files, making the material in these files, as well as the analysis coming out of the surveys, available to each of you through our publication services and through a new series called The Spec Flyer. To date, we have set up nine files in the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, including materials on the topics of Goals and Objectives Statements, Organization of the Personnel Office, Organization Charts, Performance Appraisal Methods, Affirmative Action Plans, Staff Training Programs, Staff Classification Systems and Status of Librarians. Other files are in the process of being organized. We expect to see this service continue to grow on the basis of the surveys that we make and in response to the documentation that we are able to collect from you.

The services that are available to you in this program have been described in a new brochure that was just distributed to you. Essentially, we are talking here about a series of publications and information services; of the ability to call into the Management Office, ask specific questions, and get responses based on our documents and analyses of current practice in member libraries and documentation. We try to collect this information and report on the surveys as quickly as we can. We have a target of a two-month turn-around cycle so that from the point when we send out the questionaire to you, we try to have a flyer describing the results of the survey back in your hands within two months. The secret here it seems to us is, 1) to make the requests for information simple and easy to fill out and easy to respond to, and 2) to get the results back to you very quickly in a usable form. A usable form includes both analysis of the overall survey and the original document or illustrations of some of the original documentation so that you can then look at the documents and draw your own evaluations and your own conclusions for your own internal problem-solving effort.

In addition, we have established two specialized services that are available at cost to member libraries. One is on-demand surveys. We will design, conduct and report on a survey or an issue that you feel you need information about for your internal operation. We will use our resources to do that; we will contact the liaison persons and they will report back to you directly with the results. The key here, however, is your willingness to pay for the direct costs in doing that survey, and your willingness to make the results of that survey available to all the membership.

We have done one survey in that respect for Tulane University which was interested in establishing a Friends of the Library Organization. As you know, we conducted a survey concerning this operation -- the organization of it, the financing, the activity. We did this for less than $200 for Tulane but, more importantly, the results are now available for the entire membership. We are in a position to do this on a broader basis; we have added staff capabilities in that area and can respond to your interests. The intent with this Systems and Procedures Exchange Center is to develop collectively a resource that can then be applied in an internal problem-solving fashion. We want to draw upon the experience of other libraries in this respect and, in a sense, advance the state-of-the-art.

The other thing I would like to mention is a recent inquiry that we sent to each director concerning a proposal to develop a collection of training films for the use of member libraries in internal staff development and staff training programs. This is a proposal that we really want your reaction to in terms of degree of interest. What we are asking here is if you want this central resource, would you be willing to put some money into the kitty that would allow us to buy these films and then make them available to you. We would do the selection in a way that would be responsive to your interests, but at the same time, we would provide some written discussion materials that would allow you to take these management training films and apply them to your internal staff training programs. We sent that inquiry out. I am not sure whether the mail has gotten it to each of you, but we would like a response by June.

* * * *

Report of the Executive Director

MR. McCARTHY: Ralph has already mentioned, and it has come into the discussion on scheduling of meetings, the fact that the appointment of new members to committees between January and May makes unrealistic the expectation that these committees will be active before this Spring meeting. Therefore, we do not have many committee reports; we do have several however, and I would like to mention them just briefly. They will be reproduced in the minutes of this meeting.

We have had occasion to call on some of you to contact certain Congressmen with respect to the appropriations for the NPAC program at the Library of Congress. While LC did not get the full amount requested, it did get an increase which will take care of inflation and salary increases and so on, but most important, it went over the $9 million limit which was included in the Education Amendments of 1972. I believe it is correct to interpret this as meaning that NPAC is clearly an LC program and that the limitation in the 1972 Act is no longer applicable. The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee has not yet acted; it is hoped that the Senate will increase the appropriation, but this is not assured. The NPAC Liason Committee, chaired by Frederick Wagman, has responded very well in communicating with Congressmen, and if the Senate should provide a larger sum and it goes to conference, we will certainly be calling on the NPAC Liason Committee again to get on the telephone and get the wires humming. Mr. Wagman, too, has been running a test at Michigan which shows that by holding material for 24 weeks, Michigan gets LC cards for 80% of its materials received from the NPAC countries. [The report of the NPAC Committee is included as Appendix D of these Minutes].

Another committee which has recently been reactivated and met for the first time yesterday is the Federal Relations Committee. The Committee points out that the ARL has no policy statement or position on Federal support for research libraries, and this will have the early attention of the Committee. I am sure they will be seeking ideas from many of you to go into whatever might result in the way of a policy statement.

The Committee on Foreign Newspaper Microfilming has had a number of meetings. We had a very useful meeting yesterday at which Gordon Williams gave us a detailed report on the project. [The report referred to here is included as Appendix C]. I can say that the project is adding significantly to its holdings by purchasing substantial back files of newspapers which it is already acquiring on a current basis.

Turning now to copyright, which seems to occupy a good deal of my time, the present situation as I understand it is that the Senate Subcommittee under Senator McClellan has adopted an amended version of S. 1361 which, on the one hand, clearly makes it not an infringement of copyright to provide one copy of a journal article to a reader in response to his request, but in a subsequent section, makes what is called "systematic photocopying" an infringement. The committee staff is unable to define "systematic photocopying." I suggested to Mr. Brennan, who heads the staff, that any service required an orderly procedure, and at least in one definition, that might be regarded as systematic. He assured me that I misunderstood the interest of the committee staff.

Williams and Wilkins filed a petition with the Supreme Court that the Court hear on appeal, the Williams and Wilkins versus NLM case. The Justice Department assured us at the outset that the government would oppose this petition and that they considered it very unlikely that the Supreme Court would hear the case. But when the U. S. Government goes to the Supreme Court, it goes, not through the Justice Department, but through the Office of the Solicitor General and, therefore, the matter was handed over to a staff member in the Solicitor General's office who made her first acquaintance with the case at that point. We are told that the brief opposing a Supreme Court hearing is excellent. However, the assessment of the climate has changed, and it is now expected that the Supreme Court will hear the case. This is to be decided by the Supreme Court either this week or next, and if they do agree to hear the case, it would presumably be argued in November or December of this year. If it does go to the Supreme Court, we would expect again to present an amicus brief in support of NLM.

Mr. Hopp has mentioned and I wish to apologize for the fact that we are having this meeting without your having received the minutes of the preceding meeting. I can, I believe, assure you that if the postal service does not break down, you will have them next week. We have had a lot of editorial work this spring with two Westat studies and the Hayes study. With the minutes, like another resident of Washington, we have had trouble transcribing the tapes.

You may remember that some time back, we felt it was important to get more information than we then had on the best, or on the current practices with respect to the management of computerized data bases and computerized services connected therewith in selected institutions. This project was made a part of the NASIC study and it was conducted on behalf of the ARL in conjunction with the NASIC staff by Jeffrey Gardner. The survey has been completed; the visits have been made. The report is being drafted and will be made available within, I should judge, the next month or six weeks.

I was asked to say a little bit about the International Education Project, and in the light of Mr. Berthel's report, I think I can make it brief. This is an undertaking of the American Council on Education in conjunction with certain government agencies: the State Department, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Science Foundation, the Agency for International Development, the Office of Education, Department of Commerce and others. The project is really an attempt to reorient the relationships of the federal government to what we have been accustomed to call the language and area programs. The new terminology was adopted for obvious reason: we do not like old words and old names; we like new names even if they describe old things.

We came on the scene after this committee had been in being for some time, but we did persuade the Steering Committee to establish a Task Force on Library and Information Resources. This task force is made up of librarians, bibliographers and academics who are knowledgeable with respect to the various areas and languages. We have had one meeting of this group. Later this month the task force will hold a second meeting and then, on the following day, will have a full day's meeting with about 20 additional experts who will be invited in to make presentations with respect to their various areas and to engage in discussion with the task force. This is all input to John Berthel.

Along with that, Mr. Berthel will be making some visits to selected centers to get a feel for how things work on the spot. Then he is going to hole up in a cave and write a report by July. Mr. Berthel and I are still on speaking terms, but as he gets further into this, I am not sure. I am beginning to feel some sense of withdrawl. I hope to overcome that.

You will all be pleased to know that the ARL will be presenting its recommendations to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Education and Libraries next Tuesday morning. The testimony was written by Suzanne Frankie and will be presented by her. We are also debating the presentation of a point of view on a resolution introduced by Chairman Perkins and Congressman Quie of Minnesota, which directs the Office of Education to study its statistical procedures and their failures, and to come up with recommendations as to how they can improve them. We are not too sure that this is the best approach; we would certainly like to have the statistics improved, but whether OE is the agency to study itself and say how it will improve its performance is a debatable question. Thank you very much.

* * * *

Report of the President

MR. HOPP: I am pleased to tell you that, except for new business, we are down to the last item on the agenda, which is the President's Report which will be quite brief. Having heard reports from Mr. McCarthy, there leaves really little that I need to say with respect to on-going matters of ARL. I know that many of you have been wondering about several very important matters that have not been reported on.

First, you are all aware that this is the last membership meeting that Stephen McCarthy will attend in his official capacity as Executi[illegible]rector. Many have asked me if we are going to do anything at this meeting [illegible]nize him. We struggled over that for a while, primarily because it [illegible] rather preclimactic to have a retirement occasion in May for a retirement occurring at the end of December. I asked Stephen McCarthy if he and his wife, Dorothy, could attend the next meeting of ARL which will be held in January in Chicago and he promised me that they would be there. Therefore we will be planning something at that time. Nevertheless, having said that, and since this is Stephen McCarthy's last official meeting, I think we should acknowledge with rising applause his very great contributions to the Association of Research Libraries and to many of us personally. [Applause]

I think the officers, probably more than anyone, fully appreciate the effectiveness of Mr. McCarthy as an Executive Director. And as President, I personally want to acknowledge his support while I have been President.

With Dr. McCarthy's imminent retirement, there naturally arises the next question, and that is, what are we doing about finding a successor? As was announced in Chicago last January, we have a committee that has been reviewing and talking with potential candidates; it has made its recommendations to the Executive Committee. I am optimistic that we will be able to announce an appointment before very long. The negotiations are going on, but some details have yet to be worked out before any final commitments and announcement can be made. I assure you that we, the officers, are as anxious as anyone to get this vital post filled, and we will let you know as soon as we can.

My first four months as President have been very busy ones. You will remember that William Budington left me the legacy of every committee of the Association having just been dismissed. When John McDonald reported at his last meeting as President, he said he had made more appointments than any previous President. I can easily challenge him on that score, I think. The one thing that has made my task immeasurably easier is the ready willingness with which all of you have accepted committee, commission and task force appointments. And for that, I want to express my appreciation.

One of the new committees which has not received much attention, but which may have profound effects on all of our libraries eventually is that concerned with the future of the card catalog. This committee is chaired by Joseph Rosenthal of the University of California and the membership includes your Vice-President, Richard De Gennaro, Willian Welsh of the Library of Congress, and Hugh Atkinson of Ohio State. This committee will have a report ready by our January meeting in Chicago.

Finally, because he will soon be moving to California to head a non-ARL library, David Heron has tendered his resignation from the Board of Directors. To fill this vacancy, until elections are held in January, the Board has appointed John McGowan of Northwestern University. Mr. McGowan has agreed to serve and he will begin his brief term starting with the October meeting of the Board.

The dates and places of future meetings as we now know them are: next January 18 in Chicago; May 8 and 9, of 1975, in Houston; and at this moment, January 17, 1976 in Chicago. I am not sure if we are finally committed to that 1976 date; it will depend somewhat I suppose on the outcome of the poll of the membership.

I think that we should remind you that the IFLA meeting will be held in Washington November 16 - 23, for those of you that have an interest in that.

And now, I would like to ask if there is any new business to be brought before the group? Then, is their a motion for adjournment? [A motion was made and seconded]. We are adjourned.

* * * *

APPENDIX A

RESEARCH LIBRARIES IN SERVICE TO SCHOLARSHIP

A Discussion Paper Presented to the
National Commission on Libraries and Information Science
by the Association of Research Libraries

The Association of Research Libraries has studied with interest the draft proposal of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science entitled, "A New National Program of Library and Information Science". The ARL agrees in general with the premises upon which the draft proposal is based: first, "that all citizens expect realistic and convenient access to library resources and information services in the United States"; second, "that the total information resource in the United States is a national resource which should be sustained and made available to the maximum degree possible in the public interest"; and third, "that with the help of new technology and with national resolve the disparate collection of libraries and information centers in the United States can become an integrated national system."

The Association of Research Libraries recognizes that the mandate of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science requires it to develop plans of the broadest kind involving libraries of every type in the provision of services and resources for persons of every age and undertaking. The Association of Research Libraries is, on the other hand, concerned with a particular group of libraries and with the students, scholars and other researchers who use them. The comments that follow are therefore intended not as a direct reaction to the draft proposal, but as a succinct statement of the needs of scholarship as seen from the perspective of the Association of Research Libraries. We hope that the revised plan now being developed by the National Commission and any legislation based upon that plan will encompass the needs of advanced students and scholars and the libraries that serve them. While the interests expressed herein are focussed primarily on libraries serving higher education, it should be recognized that any improvements made in these libraries will have a salutary effect throughout the entire library and information community.

The Association of Research Libraries comprises the major research libraries of the United States and Canada. It includes the larger university libraries (82 at the present time), the three national libraries of the United States - the Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library and the National Library of Medicine - and a number of public and special libraries with substantial research collections, such as the New York Public Library and the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago. The mission of the Association of Research Libraries is to strengthen and extend the capacity of its member libraries, individually and in the aggregate, to provide the recorded information needed both now and in the future by the research community. To this end the Association has identified a number of continuing objectives which the NCLIS draft proposal leads us to believe we share with the National Commission.

These objectives are as follows:

1. To extend access to recorded information.
2. To insure a national capacity for continuing development of distinctive collections and resources.
3. To bring about through collective action the more effective use of increased financial support for research library activities.

The first of these objectives is self-evident. The member libraries of the ARL have combined resources of over two hundred million volumes. They wish to share these resources with others, indeed they are now sharing them through a vast system of inter-library lending. Under the existing system, however, the larger libraries bear a disproportionate burden for this service. While we seek to improve and extend service, we wish also to correct the inequities of the present system.

The second objective recognizes that all of the libraries belonging to the ARL contain collections of unique scope and quality. The development and maintenance of these collections is a responsibility that must be shared if they are to continue to serve as a national resource, meeting national needs.

The third objective attempts to deal with the effect of rapidly rising costs upon all of the services that research libraries customarily provide. The present costs of supporting instruction and research are such that libraries are without the necessary means to undertake new programs which might result in even greater effectiveness. What is needed is sufficient risk capital to permit experimentation with various forms of collective activities whose purposes would serve not only local needs but regional or national needs as well.

In order to accomplish these objectives research libraries must do certain things differently than they have done them in the past; they must do other things better than they are now doing them; and they must do some things that they have never done before. The following list is not necessarily all-inclusive, but it is indicative.

1. Research libraries must learn how better to apply computer and communications technology in both the operational and service modes.
2. Research libraries must fashion a corporate structure for collective action, so as to be able to operate such enterprises as a national lending library.

3. Research libraries must undertake, with appropriate support, a carefully planned national program of preservation of deteriorating research materials in whatever form.

4. Research libraries must create a comprehensive bibliographic record that is standardized in form and controlled in terms of quality.

5. Research libraries must cooperate in the design of a program of library education that recognizes the complexity of the research library by training personnel for management, subject specialization, teaching (both formal and informal), bibliography and reference, and computer and communications technology.

6. Research libraries must develop a research capacity that will enable them to examine their own operations skillfully and rigorously in order that educational effectiveness may be improved, to the end that students and scholars may be better aided in their attempts to understand and to deal with the problems of society.

The Association of Research Libraries is fully aware that what it has submitted here is simply a list. Each point in the list could be expanded at length and additional points could doubtless be developed. For the present, however, our purpose seems to be best served by expressing as economically as possible the distinctive needs of research libraries as we see them. We would re-emphasize that in speaking for research libraries we believe we also speak for scholarship. In our view the needs of research libraries are synonymous with the needs of all the students, scholars and other research workers we now serve and wish to serve better in the future.

We appreciate the opportunity to share these views with the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and we stand ready to elaborate any of them with members of the Commission or its staff.

ARL Commission on External Affairs
for the Association of Research Libraries

March 28. 1974

APPENDIX B

Minutes of the Twelfth Meeting of the Advisory Committee to the ARL Center for Chinese Research Materials

The Boston Public Library
Copley Square, Boston
April 4, 1974

Present: Philip J. McNiff (Chairman)
Edwin G. Beal, Jr.
Roy Hofheinz
Ying-mao Kau
David T. Roy
Eugene Wu

Warren M. Tsuneishi (LC)
Stephen A. McCarthy (ARL)
Susan Frankie (ARL)
P. K. Yu (CCRM)
Ingeborg Knezevic (CCRM)

Mr. McNiff called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. In accordance with the agenda, Mr. McCarthy presented a financial report and gave a brief review of the three grants which the Center had been awarded since it began to operate in May 1968. He said that the present grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) provided for an annual operating amount of $110,000 over a two-year period, and that as this amount fell a little short of the total required, the difference will be made up of income from sales. He also pointed out that although under NEH provisions the Association of Research Libraries is entitled to 18.4 percent of the total grant for administrative services, the association is taking a flat sum of only $10,000 per annum. This is a consequence of the previous gift and matching grant which the Center received from both the NEH and the Ford Foundation, in which case the Ford Foundation provisions, which are lower than those of the NEH, were applied. As for the present grant, the Center has received $60,000 from September 1, 1973 through March 31, 1974, while expenses were $59,780.

Mr. McNiff presented a short sales report, pointing out that sales for the first quarter of 1974 amounted to $41,109.40, bringing the total sales to $472,429.40. He commented on the remarkable increase in sales activities, especially during February, and on the significance of sales to foreign institutions. In this connection Mr. Kau noted the impressive increase in sales to Japan during the past year. Mr. McNiff continued that the increase in the revolving fund, which had doubled since its establishment, would be a good point to raise when talking about further funding for the Center. It will also provide an opportunity to phase out the Center in an orderly fashion.

At the suggestion of Mr. McNiff, it was decided to consider an exhibition of the Center's materials at the International Federation of Library Associations' (IFLA) meeting which will be held in Washington, D.C. in November. Mr. Wu suggested the printing of a flyer about the Center for distribution to the IFLA delegates, while Mr. Roy proposed to publish a cumulative catalog, listing all the materials brought out by the Center since its inception. Such a catalog, based on all issues of the Newsletter, will be produced and is to include an order form at the end. The catalog is to be distributed free of charge at the IFLA meeting, but a charge may be put on it for later distribution by mail.

Mr. Kau gave a report on his experiences during an August 1973 visit to the People's Republic of China. He confined his report to libraries and book resources in that country. He observed that at the time of his visit many books and periodicals published at the central level were allowed for export, while such materials published at the local level were much more restricted. In this respect political criteria probably play an important part. A visitor can only go about getting materials out of the country in a rather unsystematic fashion. To mail books from larger cities, such as Peking and Shanghai, appears to be much easier than to mail them from such central cities as Wuhan where inspection is much stricter. Mr. Kau does not believe that the situation will get much better in the near future. Mr. Yu concurred with this view, citing the experience of another visitor to the PRC, who had returned as recently as March 1974 and had been subjected to much closer inspection than during a previous visit which had taken place only a few months before. Mc. McNiff remarked that Mr. Kau's report confirmed the need for continuation of the Center.

Mr. Roy gave a report on the "Conference on Priorities and Funding of the Development of Chinese Studies," which had been held in New York on November 8 and 9, 1973, sponsored by the ACLS and SSRC.

He pointed to the high level of importance attached to the Center by the participants of the conference and told the committee that prior to the conference working papers had been distributed, and that Professor Feuerwerker's paper made a particular point of the three crucial overhead facilities, one of which was the ARL Chinese Center. He read a number of passages from the conference report, a copy of which had been given to each member of the advisory committee prior to the meeting. The most forceful passage in connection with the Center reads:

> "The Center for Chinese Research Materials (CCRM) was described as the principal and most successful model of a national institution serving both individual scholars and libraries; it acquires, duplicates, and disseminates at low cost research materials on modern China. Analysis of

> its operations through the past five years shows that many of the 862 titles already made generally available by it would not have been available even in a single complete copy in this country if not located, assembled into complete works from scattered parts, and duplicated by the CCRM, and that most or all would have been excessively expensive if single institutions had attempted to acquire and copy them on their own. Examination of their sales record shows that their service has been international, to a growing clientele, and while major centers have been major customers, smaller libraries have perhaps received even more strategic benefits, because they have been able to use the bibliographic service provided by the CCRM through its NEWSLETTER, and purchase at low cost rare materials supporting immediate and specific research needs of their faculty members. Conferees who have served on the advisory board of the CCRM described its present plans, making it clear that the CCRM is a continuing necessity to the field."

Mr. Roy said that while many issues raised during the conference remained undecided, there had been unanimous agreement among the participants that the Center must be continued. The committee agreed that this report will be of great importance in any future approach with respect to further funding.

During a lunch break the conversion of the Chinese Materials and Research Aids Service Center, Inc. (CMRASC, Inc.) to Chinese Materials Center, Inc. was discussed. This conversion will make Mr. Irick's operation independent of the Association for Asian Studies, of which it has been a subsidiary until now. The advisory committee members felt that although Mr. Irick's firm may have more freedom to reprint and publish materials in areas in which it had not previously engaged, its activities would in all probability not conflict with those of the CCRM.

When the meeting resumed at 3:00 p.m. the discussion turned to the Center's future reproduction plans. Mr. Yu drew attention to the reproduction on approximately 260 reels of microfilm of the North China Daily News, of which an almost complete file, covering the periods 1862-1898, 1914-1918, 1923-1941, and 1947-1949, had been assembled by combining the holdings of the Tokyo University Library, the National Diet Library of Japan, and the British Museum. He also singled out the early editions of the Jen-min jih-pao from May 1946 to February 1949, which many libraries do not have in their collections, and which the Center will make available on microfilm.

In discussing the newspaper supplements which the Center is currently making available and will continue to make available, the project was considered worthwhile in that it brought these supplements into a convenient form for use by researchers.

Mr. Yu pointed out that not all future projects had been listed in his report and that one of those not listed was the *Kuang-chou Min-kuo jih-pao* (1926-1927) in the holdings of Harvard-Yenching Library, which will be made available in the near future.

Mr. Hofheinz commended Mr. Yu on the research aids included in the plan, as well as on the series of monographs on economics, but wondered whether it might not be wise to include a number of more basic works to increase the series' general appeal. Other titles and materials which the members recommended for reproduction by the Center included *Bolshevika* (of which Harvard-Yenching Library owns the issues covering 1928-1929); works on the economics of provinces; and compendia of rules and regulations of various areas. Mr. Yu pointed out that he had written to the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in East Berlin regarding the latter, as well as works on statistics and budgeting, but that no reply had as yet been received. Mr. Wu proposed that some of these suggested titles be listed in a questionnaire which should be included in one of the Center's future issues of the *Newsletter*, requesting subscribers to circle the items they would like to see reproduced by the Center.

Mr. Beal urged Mr. Yu to contact the East Asiatic Library of the University of California at Berkeley to make available to the Center Xerox copies of the incomplete list of titles which Mr. Raymond Tang had purchased during his visit to the PRC in March 1973 to ascertain whether any of the approximately 4,500 titles would fit into the scope of the Center's reproduction programs. Mr. Kau suggested that once the incomplete list had been obtained from Berkeley, and before deciding on reproducing some of the titles, they should be carefully checked against the book lists of Hong Kong bookdealers.

The committee turned to the question of what services the Center should try to perform beyond 1975. Mr. Yu pointed out that this item had been included on the agenda in response to a question put to Dr. McCarthy by Mr. Robert J. Kingston, Deputy Chairman of the NEH, during a recent meeting of the American Council on Education's Government/Academic International Education Interface Committee as to the rationale for continuation of the Center.

Mr. Hofheinz thought that one of the areas into which the Center could move lay in some of the services which are currently performed by the Hong Kong Consulate General. He referred in particular to a series in card form of biographical data on prominent figures in the PRC, which the Hong Kong Consulate General has shared with a number of institutions through the Universities Service Centre since 1968. He stated that this information, which was originally put on microfilm by the consulate until 1968, and was currently being made available in Xerox form, had been piling up and needed to be brought under control. He suggested that the Center might be a possible vehicle for this task. Mr. Yu replied that such a project had previously been under consideration, but had been found too costly for the Center to pursue unless additional funds could be secured. Mr. Wu felt that the Center should do projects which do not require a large cash output but would add dimension to the chances of convincing foundations and agencies of the need for continued operation of the Center.

Mr. McCarthy stated that a good case could be made for the Center seven or eight years ago when there was an extreme drought with respect to materials on contemporary China. He added while the statement in the New York conference report would be very useful, foundations would not be inclined to support this or any operation indefinitely. Mr. Wu said that when the Ford Foundation was approached prior to the founding of the Center, the issue had been materials on contemporary China. Since then, there has been a gradual shift in research to go back to the Republican period, 1911 to 1949. He suggested that a very effective case for Chinese materials covering that period could be built. Such a project could no doubt get the support of the academic community.

Mr. Kau stated that he would like to see the Center continue its present work, but if new services were a must in order to obtain further funding, he would suggest bibliographic services, such as indexing and bringing under control the FBIS and JPRS. To this Mr. Hofheinz added the indexing of the Red Guard publications.

It was also pointed out that the original guidelines for the Center excluded a number of services and that just those exclusions might now be used in building a new program.

Mr. Hofheinz asked how much of the Center's cost was overhead and how much was production related, and to what degree the Center might be able to continue to function. Mr. McCarthy replied that the figures given in the financial report did not refer to investment in production, but constituted administrative and editorial costs. At present the revolving fund amounts to approximately $150,000, and a year from now it will have increased somewhat if production and sales continue at the same volume. If no further grant is awarded, this sum will enable the Center to continue for a period of one to one and a half years. Mr. Hofheinz suggested an increase in the Center's prices of publications, which would eventually make the Center self-supporting. Mr. Yu felt that prices could not be raised to that level, and Mr. McCarthy added that one of the initial reasons for establishing the Center had been that materials should be made available at low cost. Mr. Roy voiced doubt over whether institutions and individuals in particular would be able to purchase the Center's materials if prices were raised substantially. Mr. Hofheinz replied that if somebody was genuinely eager for the materials, he would be willing to pay a higher price.

To a question by Mr. McNiff to what extent the academic community and Chinese libraries want to support the Center, the feeling was that much assistance and intellectual cooperation in identifying materials had been received in the past and that there had been a few instances where a lot of preparatory work had been carried out by libraries aiding in the Center's projects. As for financial assistance from research centers and libraries, the outlook appeared to be slim.

Mr. Wu thought that raising prices might be a more realistic approach than the effort to obtain contributions from research libraries. He said that by raising the prices the gap between overhead cost and sales income could be narrowed, and as a consequence the Center would be in a better position to talk to foundations. Mr. Hofheinz added that differential pricing might also be useful.

In summing up the discussion, Mr. McNiff stated that there appeared to be general acceptance that the Center should be continued in the interest of the research community. Mr. Yu and the committee should now look into what the future goals should be, what possible new services the Center might perform and make up a list of such services to get support. The possibility of narrowing the gap between increasing cost and increasing sales potential should be investigated. An increase in prices might be one in line with the increase of publications put out by commercial operations. The Center should look over its financial overhead record during the past years and determine whether the level could be maintained. Even closer work with the academic community and the two councils, ACLS and SSRC, will be necessary.

Mr. McNiff proposed to establish a subcommittee which should look at these matters and determine ways and means to obtain further funding. This subcommittee should include members of the advisory committee as well as members of the research community. After some deliberation, Messrs. Hofheinz and Wu as members of the advisory committee consented to serving. Mr. McNiff will also approach Messrs. Albert Feuerwerker (University of Michigan), Frederick W. Mote (Princeton University), Philip Kuhn (University of Chicago), and William F. Dorrill (University of Pittsburgh) and request them to serve on the subcommittee. He will subsequently appoint a chairman. It is hoped that this review and planning committee can meet for the first time in May 1974, since any presentation to a foundation would have to be made no later than January or February 1975.

Before adjourning at 4:30 p.m., the tentative date for the next meeting of the advisory committee was set for Friday, November 8, 1974.

April 15, 1974

Memo to: Messrs. Philip J. McNiff
Edwin G. Beal, Jr.
Roy Hofheinz
Ying-mao Kau
David T. Roy
Eugene Wu

From: P. K. Yu

On April 11, 1974 I sent you a copy of the minutes of the twelfth meeting of the advisory committee held on April 4. It was only after the minutes had been sent out that it occurred to us that one statement made therein might not be clear to those members who have not served on the committee from its very beginning in 1968. The statement reads as follows:

> "It was also pointed out that the original guidelines for the Center excluded a number of services and that just those exclusions might now be used in building a new program."
> (Please refer to page 5, paragraph 3 of the minutes)

Since not all of you are familiar with the original guidelines, we thought it best to give you a short explanation and to list those services which were contained in the original proposal to the Ford Foundation, but which were later excluded.

On February 10, 1966 the Joint Committee on Contemporary China of the ACLS/SSRC submitted a variety of bibliographic projects to the Ford Foundation, which would support scholarly activities in the field of Chinese studies. These projects which were combined under the broad title of "Scholarly Resources Development Program, Contemporary China," included the following programs to be undertaken over a five-year period:

Project	Proposed Budget
1. Scholarly Resources Development Project; (This was later changed to Center for Chinese Research Materials)	$575,431
2. Bibliographies of Japanese Research on Contemporary China;	30,000

3.	Microfilming of Communist Chinese Journals;	$ 30,000
4.	Sorting and Microfilming of Provincial Chinese Newspapers;	40,000
5.	Index to Translations of Materials on China by JPRS;	95,000
6.	Improvement of Index to Publications of U.S. Consulate General in Hong Kong;	25,000
7.	Fellowships for Training Librarians to Service Chinese Collections;	250,000
8.	Current Digest of Translations from Chinese Communist Sources;	200,000

Because of funding limitations the Ford Foundation accepted only the CCRM project at the time. The formerly excluded projects and services might now be considered in building a new program in our efforts to obtain further funding.

In view of the fact that this letter relates to the contents of the minutes, I would suggest that you attach it to your copy of the minutes.

PKY:ik

cc. Dr. Warren M. Tsuneishi
Dr. Stephen A. McCarthy
Mrs. Susan Frankie

APPENDIX C

ARL FOREIGN NEWSPAPER MICROFILM PROJECT
Report for Calendar 1973

by
Gordon Williams
Center for Research Libraries

1. Subscribers

There are now 80 libraries subscribing to the project.

2. Coverage

The project is providing subscribers microfilm copies of 143 newspapers on a current basis. Of these, the project is itself microfilming 80 titles, and it is buying positive microfilm copies of 63 titles from other, mostly commercial films. This is an increase of 23 titles over 1972.

In addition to these 143 current titles, the project has available microfilm copies, in various length of files, for another 61 titles that have ceased publication since they were first added to the project, or have become unavailable for other reasons, such as the inability or unwillingness of the publisher to provide copies on a regular basis.

During the year the project extended the back files of 8 titles by the purchase of positive microfilm. Back files of 11 more titles at a cost of $9,500 have already been ordered so far in 1974, and another 12 at an estimated cost of $25,000 are under consideration for purchase by the committee.

3. Use of the Project

During the year the project received 905 requests for loan of positive microfilm. 821 of these requests were filled, an average of about three per day. The 84 unfilled requests were for a portion of a file not owned by the project.

Approximately 1,116,000 feet of positive microfilm was produced from project-owned negatives for purchase by libraries. Of this, 767,000 were for libraries subscribing to the project, and 349,000 feet were for non-subscribing libraries.

4. Financial Report

A financial report for 1973, and an estimated budget for 1974 are attached. In summary, during 1973 the project took in $164,733. It expended $153,784 and incurred commitments for an additional $17,200 for a total expenditure and commitment of $170,984, leaving a free balance of $71,234.

STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

for the year ended December 31, 1973

	Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project	Foreign Official Gazette Project
Receipts:		
Membership dues, current year	$ 61,933.01	$ 200.00
Membership dues, prior years	11,752.97	489.85
Collections on sales to members	48,955.97	-
Collections on sales to nonmembers	41,290.77	-
Interest	800.00	-
	$164,732.72	$ 689.85
Disbursements:		
Newspapers and microfilm	51,078.84	-
Purchases for members	49,872.69	-
Purchases for nonmembers	22,658.01	-
Salaries and wages	23,699.08	100.00
Supplies	1,177.33	-
Storage	256.00	24.00
Audit	550.00	50.00
Payroll taxes	2,026.27	-
Insurance	618.03	-
Royalties	1,746.09	-
Miscellaneous	102.05	
	153,784.39	174.00
Excess of receipts over disbursements	10,948.33	515.85
Fund balance, December 31, 1972	77,486.32	10,326.30
Fund balance, December 31, 1973	$ 88,434.65	$10,842.15

ARL - Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project

Budget, 1974

Expenditures	
Subscriptions to paper copies	$ 4,657
Subscriptions to microfilm copies	9,516
Microfilming (negative and one loan positive)	24,657
Salaries	31,270
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$ 70,100

Income	
Membership Dues	$ 62,905
Sale to non-members	15,000
TOTAL INCOME	$ 77,905

Fund Balance, December 31, 1973	$88,434	
Commitments for microfilming 1973 issues	-17,200	
Commitments for back file purchases	- 9,582	
Excess, income over expense, 1974	7,805	
Fund Balance 12/31/74	$69,457	(less any further back-file purchase)

Retrospective Titles Recommended for Purchase by the ARL Foreign Newspaper Project (Factors taken into consideration: research importance, present Project holdings, present availability in American or Canadian libraries, and demand.)

* = first priority

Title and Dates		Present Project Holdings	Vendor and Approximate Price	
*El Comercio, Quito	1948-1955	1956-	DLC	$ 400.
La Croix, Paris	1883-1952	1953-	ACRPP	2,700.
Dagens Nyheter, Stockholm	1864-1951	1952-	Centrala	2,200.
*France Soir, Paris	1944-1952	1953-	ACRPP	300.
*International Herald Tribune, Paris	1887-1916 1931-1952	1917-1930 1953-	MCA	1,368. 924.
*El Mercurio, Santiago	1914-1937 1953-1955	1938-1943 1946-1947	DLC	1,746. 480.
*La Nacion, Buenos Aires	July 1, 1939-1950	(Oct. 1923-June 1939)	DLC	840.
*El Nacional, Caracas	July 1962-1964	1965-	DLC	380.
*Neue Zurcher Zeitung, Zurich	July 1914-1937	July 1938-	ICU	900.
*Observer, London	1916-1955	1956-	Group, Yorkshire	1,700.
Osservatore Romano, Vatican City	1849-1950	1951-	UnM	2,800.
Politiken, Copenhagen	1901-1951	(1890-1900), 1952-	Minerva	4,800.
Le Populaire, Paris	1916-1940 1944-1952	1953-	ACRPP	800. 200.
*Toronto Globe & Mail	1896-May 1938 March 1946-1951	June 1938-Feb. 1946, 1952-	Publisher	5,000.
*Die Zeit, Hamburg	1946-1972	1973-	Mikropress	1,000.
				$29,538

*first priority: $15,038

APPENDIX D

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR ACQUISITIONS AND CATALOGING

(1) During the past year LC added two Chinese catalogers. The House Appropriation Bill provides for one more. The Senate has not yet acted on the LC appropriation.

(2) The House has provided an increase for the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging above the authorization in the Higher Education Act. Therefore the Program is now solidly in the LC budget and authority.

(3) LC may be able to expand the NPAC if the House appropriation is increased in the Senate.

(4) LC is planning a systems study of its cataloging to speed the work.

(5) The Committee on the NPAC is meeting today to discuss priorities for expansion of the program to be urged at LC and also to consider other next steps, e.g., inclusion of more cataloging in the MARC tapes.

(6) A study at The University of Michigan indicated that LC has cards available within 24 weeks for 80 percent of the monographs acquired by Michigan from the NPAC countries. This study was too brief, however, and will be made more sophisticated and repeated. Also, several other libraries will be asked to duplicate the study.

Frederick H. Wagman, Chairman

May 9, 1974

APPENDIX E

RESOLUTION ON THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES

WHEREAS, a bill has been introduced to provide for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services which would afford an opportunity to examine the variety of services libraries are able to perform today as well as to explore new directions for tommorrow, and

WHEREAS, in our judgment such a Conference could serve an important and useful purpose in the improvement of the nation's libraries and information centers and their use by the public, therefore

The Association of Research Libraries adopts this resolution urging the Congress and Administration to take favorable action in support of the resolution calling for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

May 10, 1974

APPENDIX F

ATTENDANCE AT 84TH MEETING

University of Alabama Libraries
James F. Wyatt

University of Alberta Library
Bruce Peel

University of Arizona Library
W. David Laird

Arizona State University Library
Donald W. Koepp

Boston Public Library
Philip J. McNiff

Boston University Library
John Laucus

Brigham Young University Libraries
Donald K. Nelson

University of British Columbia Library
Basil Stuart-Stubbs

University of California Library,
(Berkeley) Richard Dougherty

University of California Library,
(Davis) J. R. Blanchard

University of California Library,
(Los Angeles) Page Ackerman

University of California Library,
(San Diego) Melvin J. Voigt

University of California Library,
(Santa Barbara) Donald C. Davidson

Center for Research Libraries
Gordon R. Williams

University of Chicago Library
Stanley McElderry

University of Colorado Library
Ellsworth Mason

Columbia University Libraries
Warren J. Haas

University of Connecticut Library
John P. McDonald

Cornell University Libraries
G. F. Shepherd, Jr.

Dartmouth College Libraries
Edward C. Lathem

Duke University Libraries
Benjamin E. Powell

University of Florida Libraries
Gustave A. Harrer

Florida State University Library
Charles E. Miller

Georgetown University Library
Joseph E. Jeffs

University of Georgia Libraries
Warren N. Boes

Harvard University Library
Douglas W. Bryant

Howard University Libraries
Kenneth Wilson

Indiana University Libraries
W. Carl Jackson

University of Iowa Libraries
Leslie W. Dunlap

John Crerar Library
William S. Budington

Johns Hopkins University Library
John H. Berthel

Joint University Libraries
Frank P. Grisham

University of Kansas Library
David W. Heron

Library of Congress
John Lorenz

Louisiana State University Library
George Guidry

McGill University Library
Richard A. Farley

University of Maryland Library
Howard Rovelstad

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Richard J. Talbot

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Libraries Natalie N. Nicholson

University of Michigan Library
Frederick H. Wagman

Michigan State University Library
Richard E. Chapin

University of Minnesota Libraries
Ralph H. Hopp

National Agricultural Library
Joseph F. Caponio

National Library of Canada
Joseph Guy Sylvestre

National Library of Medicine
Joseph Gantner

University of Nebraska Libraries
Eugene M. Johnson

New York Public Library
James Henderson

New York State Library
John A. Humphry

New York University Libraries
Palmer A. Brynildson

University of North Carolina Libraries
James F. Govan

Northwestern University Libraries
John P. McGowan

University of Notre Dame Libraries
David W. Sparks

Ohio State University Libraries
Hugh Atkinson

University of Oklahoma Library
James K. Zink

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
H. W. Axford

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Richard De Gennaro

Pennsylvania State University Library
Stuart Forth

University of Pittsburgh Library
Frances Parker

Princeton University Library
William S. Dix

Rice University Library
Richard L. O'Keeffe

University of Rochester Libraries
Ben C. Bowman

Rutgers University Library
Virginia Whitney

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Elaine Sloan

Southern Illinois University Library
F. S. Randall

Stanford University Libraries
David C. Weber

State University of New York at Buffalo
Libraries Eldred Smith

Syracuse University Library
Metod M. Milac

Temple University Library
Arthur Hamlin

University of Tennessee Libraries
Richard W. Boss

University of Texas Libraries
Merle N. Boylan

Texas A & M University Library
Henry L. Alsmeyer, Jr.

University of Toronto Libraries
Robert Blackburn

Tulane University Library
Robert Patterson

University of Utah Library
Roger K. Hanson

University of Washington Library
Nina Cohen

Washington State University Library
G. Donald Smith

Wayne State University Libraries
Vern M. Pings

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Joseph H. Treyz

Yale University Libraries
Rutherford D. Rogers

ARL Staff:

Stephen A. McCarthy......................Executive Director
Suzanne Frankie..........................Assistant Executive Director
Duane E. Webster.........................Director, Office of University Library Management Studies
Jeffrey Gardner..........................Management Research Specialist

Guests

Margaret Beckman, Canadian Association of College and University Libraries
Henry Campbell, Toronto Public Library
Fred Cole, Council on Library Resources
Robert M. Hayes, Becker & Hayes Inc.
Lawrence Livingston, Council on Library Resources
Beverly Lynch, Association of College and Research Libraries/ALA
Bernard McNamee, Canadian Library Association
Keyes Metcalf
Frank Milligan, The Canadian Council
Foster Mohrhardt, Council on Library Resources
Vernon E. Palmour, Westat Inc.
James Skipper, Kraus-Thomson Organization Ltd.
Charles Stevens, National Commission on Libraries & Information Science
David Wax, Northeast Academic Science Information Center
Edward C. Weiss, NSF, Office of Science Information Service

Members Not Represented:

University of Cincinnati Libraries
University of Illinois Library
Iowa State University Library
University of Kentucky Libraries
Purdue University Library
University of Southern California Library
University of Virginia Libraries
Washington University Libraries, St. Louis

APPENDIX G

COMMISSIONS, COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES OF THE ARL

April 1974

ARL COMMISSIONS

1. Commission on Development of Resources

   Page Ackerman (Jan. 1975)
   Basil Stuart-Stubbs (Jan. 1976)
   Gustave Harrer, Chairman (Jan. 1977)

2. Commission on Organization of Resources

   John McGowan (Jan. 1977)
   Joseph Treyz, Jr. (Jan. 1975)
   William Budington, Chairman (Jan. 1975)

3. Commission on Access to Resources

   John Berthel (Jan. 1977)
   Richard Boss (Jan. 1977)
   Virginia Whitney, Chairman (Jan. 1976)

4. Commission on Management of Research Libraries

   Richard De Gennaro (Jan. 1975)
   Warren Haas (Jan. 1976)
   Stanley McElderry, Chairman (Jan. 1976)

5. Commission on External Affairs

   John McDonald (Jan. 1976)
   Lucien White (Jan. 1977)
   William S. Dix, Chairman (Jan. 1977)

6. ARL Executive Committee

   William Budington, Past President
   Richard De Gennaro, Vice President & President-elect
   Stephen McCarthy, Executive Director
   Ralph Hopp, President, Chairman

ARL STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books

William Bond
William Cagle
John Finzi
Herman Kahn
Ray Frantz, Jr., Chairman

Committee on Center for Chinese Research Materials

Edwin G. Beal, Jr.
Roy Hofheinz, Jr.
Ying-mao Kau
David T. Roy
Eugene Wu
Philip McNiff, Chairman

Committee on Copyright

Howard Rovelstad, Chairman

Committee on Federal Relations

W. Carl Jackson
Eugene Kennedy
Benjamin Powell
Rutherford Rogers
Paul Willis
Stuart Forth, Chairman

Committee on Foreign Newspapers on Microfilm

Basil Stuart-Stubbs
Lucien White
Gordon Williams
John Lorenz, Chairman

Committee on Interlibrary Loan

Richard Chapin
David Heron
John Humphry
Jay Lucker
David Weber, Chairman

National Program for Acquisitons and Cataloging Liaison Committee

Philip McNiff
Howard Sullivan
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr.
Frederick Wagman, Chairman

Committee on Negro Academic Libraries

Arthur Hamlin
Warren Boes, Chairman

Committee on Nominations

ARL Vice President, Chairman

Committee on Preservation of Research Libraries Materials

Robert Blackburn
Douglas Bryant
Herman Fussler
L. Quincy Mumford
Rutherford Rogers
Gordon Williams
Frazier Poole

AREA COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN ACQUISITIONS

Africa

Hans Panofsky, Northwestern, Chairman
Peter Duignan, Hoover
Beverly Gray, Boston University
Conrad Reining, Georgetown
Julian Witherell, Library of Congress

Middle East

David H. Partington, Harvard, Chairman
George N. Atiyeh, Library of Congress
James Pollack, Indiana

Eastern Europe

Marion Milczewski, Washington, Chairman
Joseph A. Placek, Michigan
Paul Horecky, Library of Congress

Far East

Warren Tsuneishi, Library of Congress, Chairman
Weying Wan, Michigan
Eugene Wu, Harvard

South Asia

Louis A. Jacob, Pennsylvania, Chairman
Maureen Patterson, Chicago
Paul Fasana, New York Public Library
Richard De Gennaro, Pennsylvania

Southeast Asia

Giok Po Oey, Cornell, Chairman
Charles Bryant, Yale
John Musgrave, Michigan

Latin American

Carl W. Deal, Illinois, Urbana, Chairman
Nettie Lee Benson, Texas
Donald Wisdom, Library of Congress

Western Europe

Howard Sullivan, Wayne State, Chairman
Norman Dudley, UCLA
Yen-Tsai Feng, Boston Public
William H. Kurth, Washington, St. Louis

ARL TASK FORCES

Task Force on Future of the Card Catalog

Hugh Atkinson
Richard De Gennaro
William Welsh
Joseph Rosenthal, Chairman

Task Force on Library Services to External Scholars

Richard Chapin
Natalie Nicholson
Richard O'Keeffe, Chairman

Task Force on National Periodical Resources Plan

Melvin Voigt
Gordon Williams
Arthur Hamlin, Chairman

ARL-ACRL Task Force on University Library Standards

Clifton Brock
Gustave Harrer
Jay Lucker
Ellsworth Mason
John McDonald
Jasper G. Schad
Robert Downs, Chairman

REPRESENTATIVES

ANSI Committee Z-39	Eugene Kennedy
CONSER Project	John McGowan
Joint Committee on Union List of Serials	William Budington
Joint Statistics Coordinating Committee	Jeffrey Gardner
Library Relations Committee of the National Microfilm Association	Ralph E. McCoy
United States Book Exchange	John Berthel

APPENDIX H

MEMBERSHIP OF ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

MAY 1974

University of Alabama Libraries
University, Alabama 35486
James F. Wyatt, Dean of Libraries
(205) 348-5298

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
Bruce Peel, Director
(403) 432-3790

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
W. David Laird, Librarian
(602) 884-2101

Arizona State University Library
Tempe, Arizona 85281
Donald W. Koepp, Librarian
(602) 965-3415

Boston Public Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Philip J. McNiff, Librarian
(617) 536-5400

Boston University Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director
(617) 353-3710

Brigham Young University Libraries
Provo, Utah 84601
Donald K. Nelson, Director
(801) 374-1211 ext. 2905

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver 8, British Columbia, Canada
Basil Stuart-Stubbs, Librarian
(604) 228-2298

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
David A. Jonah Librarian
(401) 863-2162

University of California Library
Berkeley, California 94720
Richard Dougherty, Librarian
(415) 642-3773

University of California Library
Davis, California 95616
J. R. Blanchard, Librarian
(916) 752-2110 ext. 2167

University of California Library
Los Angeles, California 90024
Page Ackerman, Librarian
(213) 825-1201

University of California Library, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92037
Melvin J. Voigt, Librarian
(714) 453-2000

University of California Library
Santa Barbara, California 93106
Donald Davidson, Librarian
(805) 961-3256

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
James V. Jones, Director
(216) 368-2990

Center for Research Libraries
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Gordon R. Williams, Director
(312) 955-4545

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Stanley McElderry, Director
(312) 753-2933

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
Harold Schell, Dean, Library Admin. &
Director of Libraries (513) 475-2533

University of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80304
Ellsworth C. Mason, Director
(303) 443-2211 ext. 7511

Columbia University Libraries
New York, New York 10027
Warren J. Haas, Vice President &
Librarian (212) 280-2247

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
John P. McDonald, Director
(203) 486-2219

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
G. F. Shepherd, Jr., Acting Director
(607) 256-3689

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Edward C. Lathem, Librarian
(603) 646-2236

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Benjamin E. Powell, Librarian
(919) 684-2034

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Gustave A. Harrer, Director
(904) 392-0341

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Charles Miller, Librarian
(904) 599-3290

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D. C. 20007
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director
(202) 625-4095

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
Warren N. Boes, Director
(404) 542-2716

Harvard University Library
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Douglas W. Bryant, Director
(617) 495-2404

Howard University Libraries
Washington, D. C. 20001
Kenneth S. Wilson, Acting Director
(202) 636-7234

University of Illinois Library
Urbana, Illinois 61803
Lucien W. White, Librarian
(217) 333-0790

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
W. Carl Jackson, Dean of Libraries
(812) 337-3404

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Leslie W. Dunlap, Dean of Library
Administration (319) 353-4450

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50010
Warren Kuhn, Dean of Library Services
(515) 294-1442

John Crerar Library
Chicago, Illinois 60616
William S. Budington, Director
(312) 225-2526

Johns Hopkins University Library
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
John H. Berthel, Librarian
(301) 366-3300 ext. 437

Joint University Libraries
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Frank P. Grisham, Director
(615) 322-2834

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
David W. Heron, Director
(913) 864-3601

Kent State University Library
Kent, Ohio 44242
Hyman W. Kritzer, Assistant Provost &
Director of Libraries (216) 672-2962

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Paul Willis, Director
(606) 257-3801

Library of Congress
Washington, D. C. 20540
L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian
(202) 426-5205

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Thomas D. Gillies, Acting Director
(816) 363-4600

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
George Guidry Jr., Acting Director
(504) 388-3969

McGill University Library
Montreal 112, Quebec, Canada
Richard A. Farley, Director
(514) 392-4949

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
Howard Rovelstad, Librarian
(301) 454-3011

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
Richard J. Talbot, Director
(413) 545-0284

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libraries
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
Natalie N. Nicholson, Director
(617) 253-5651

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
Frederick H. Wagman, Director
(313) 764-9356

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard E. Chapin, Librarian
(517) 355-2341

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Ralph H. Hopp, Director
(612) 373-3097

University of Missouri Library
Columbia, Missouri 65201
Dwight Tuckwood, Director
(314) 882-2739

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
Joseph F. Caponio, Acting Director
(301) 344-3779

National Library of Canada
Ottawa 4, Ontario, Canada
Joseph Guy Sylvestre, Librarian
(613) 992-0401

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Martin M. Cummings, Director
(301) 496-6221

University of Nebraska Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Adam C. Breckenridge, Acting Director
(402) 472-7211

New York Public Library
New York, New York 10018
Richard W. Couper, President
(212) 695-3231

New York State Library
Albany, New York 12224
John A. Humphry, Asst. Commissioner
for Libraries (518) 474-5930

New York University Libraries
New York, New York 10003
Eugene Kennedy, Dean of Libraries
(212) 598-2140

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27415
James F. Govan, Director
(919) 933-1301

Northwestern University Libraries
Evanston, Illinois 60210
John P. McGowan, Librarian
(312) 492-7640

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
David E. Sparks, Director
(219) 283-7317

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Hugh Atkinson, Director
(614) 422-6152

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
James K. Zink, Director
(405) 325-2611

Oklahoma State University Library
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74075
Roscoe Rouse, Librarian
(405) 372-6211 ext. 237

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
H. William Axford, University Librarian
(503) 686-3056

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19174
Richard De Gennaro, Director
(215) 594-7091

Pennsylvania State University Libraries
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
Stuart Forth, Dean of University
Libraries (814) 865-0401

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Glenora Edwards Rossell, Director
(412) 624-4401

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
William S. Dix, Librarian
(609) 452-3190

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Joseph M. Dagnese, Director
(317) 494-8663

Rice University Library
Houston, Texas 77001
Richard L. O'Keeffe, Librarian
(713) 528-4141

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
Ben Bowman, Director
(716) 275-4461

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Virginia P. Whitney, Librarian
(201) 932-7505

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Washington, D. C. 20560
Russell Shank, Director
(202) 381-5496

University of Southern California Library
Los Angeles, California 90007
Roy L. Kidman, Librarian
(213) 746-2543

Southern Illinois University Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Ralph E. McCoy, Dean of Library Affairs
(618) 453-2522

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California 94305
David C. Weber, Director
(415) 321-2300 ext. 2016

State University of New York-Buffalo
Libraries Buffalo, New York 14214
Eldred Smith, Director
(716) 831-4205

Syracuse University Libraries
Syracuse, New York 13210
Metod M. Milac, Acting Director
(315) 423-2574

Temple University Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Arthur Hamlin, Director
(215) 787-8231

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Richard W. Boss, Director
(615) 974-4127

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Merle N. Boylan, Director
(512) 471-3561

Texas A & M University Library
College Station, Texas 77843
Henry L. Alsmeyer, Jr., Associate Director
(713) 845-6111

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada
Robert H. Blackburn, Chief Librarian
(416) 928-2292

Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
John H. Gribbin, Director
(504) 865-5131

University of Utah Libraries
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Roger Hanson, Director
(801) 581-6741

University of Virginia Libraries
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901
Ray Frantz, Jr., Librarian
(804) 924-3026

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98105
Marion A. Milczewski, Director
(206) 543-1760

Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington 99163
G. Donald Smith, Director
(509) 335-4557

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
William Kurth, Librarian
(314) 863-0100 ext. 4523

Wayne State University Libraries
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Vern M. Pings, Director
(313) 577-4020

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr., Director
(608) 262-3521

Yale University Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Rutherford D. Rogers, Librarian
(203) 436-2456

Minutes of the meetings of the Association of Research Libraries are published semiannually. Subscription rates for U.S.A. and possessions are $10.00 a year; $5.00 an issue (foreign: $11.20 a year; $6.20 an issue). Checks should be made payable to the Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

Association of Research Libraries.
Minutes of the meeting. 1st–
Dec. 1932–
[Princeton, N. J., etc.]

v. 28 cm.

Meetings are numbered irregularly: 9th–10th, 12th called respectively: 10th–11th, 13th.
Indexes:
Subject index.

1st–42d, Dec. 1932–Jan. 1954. 1 v.

Z673.A84 50–30046

Library of Congress [8]

These Minutes are printed on a stable and enduring paper.